00110879

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 19 September, 2016

PRINCIPLES AT STAKE.

ESSAYS ON

CHURCH QUESTIONS OF THE DAY.

110879

EDITED BY

GEORGE HENRY SUMNER, M.A.,

RECTOR OF OLD ALRESFORD, HANTS,
AND CHAPLAIN TO THE LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

B. (a. 71

ROYAL LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ASIATIC SOCIETY

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.
1868.

The right of Translation is reserved.

God
264
Sam/Pri
110879

LONDON: PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, DUKE STREET, STAMFORD STREET,
AND CHARING CROSS.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

I.—RITUALISM AND UNIFORMITY 1

BENJAMIN SHAW, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

II.—THE INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND 43

LORD ARTHUR HERVEY, M.A., Archdeacon of Sudbury and Rector of Ickworth with Horringer.

III.—THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE PRIESTHOOD 65

R. PAYNE SMITH, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.

IV.—NATIONAL EDUCATION 109

ALEXANDER R. GRANT, M.A., Rector of Hitcham, Suffolk, late H.M. Inspector of Schools.

V.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST CONSIDERED IN CONNECTION WITH STATEMENTS RECENTLY PUT FORTH RESPECTING THAT HOLY SACRAMENT .. 133

THE EDITOR.

VI.—SCRIPTURE AND RITUAL 171

T. D. BERNARD, M.A., Rector of Walcot and Canon of Wells.

VII.—THE CHURCH IN SOUTH AFRICA 201

ARTHUR MILLS, M.A., of Balliol College, Oxford.

VIII.—THE SCHISMATICAL TENDENCY OF RITUALISM 229

GEORGE SALMON, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin.

IX.—THE REVISIONS OF THE LITURGY CONSIDERED IN THEIR BEARING ON RITUALISM 259

W. G. HUMPHRY, B.D., Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, London; late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

X.—PARTIES AND PARTY SPIRIT 341

JOHN S. HOWSON, D.D., Dean of Chester.

NOTE.

THE several contributors to this Volume are responsible only for the statements and opinions contained in their own Essays.

ESSAY I.

RITUALISM AND UNIFORMITY.

By BENJAMIN SHAW, M.A.,

Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY I.

1. Impatience in the present day of questions of mere external uniformity.
2. The question of Ritualism not such a question.
3. It is a question of acts done in the prosecution of a purpose which is—
   (*a*). Important in itself.
   (*b*). Common to a number of persons combined to carry it out.
   (*c*). Hostile to the Reformation settlement of the Church of England.
4. Evidence in support of allegation (*a*).
5. Evidence in support of allegation (*b*).
6. Evidence in support of allegation (*c*).
7. Peculiar constitution of the Church, and how it bears on the subject.
8. Consideration of the objection that there are variations from uniformity on the part of the opposite school in the Church.
9. These variations distinguishable in nature and principle from those of Ritualism.
10. Consideration of the assertion that extreme Protestant opinions are even more alien from the Church than are the principles of Rome itself.
11. Recognition of Protestant bodies in former times.
12. Did the last revision of the Prayer-book effect a change in this respect?
13. Opinions of Bishop Cosin.
14. And of Archbishop Wake.
15. Resumption and conclusion of the argument. Under the circumstances at present existing the rules of the Church on the subject of uniformity may fairly be appealed to against Ritualist practices.

RITUALISM AND UNIFORMITY.

I. At the close of the seventeenth century, when the Turks broke into Christendom and besieged Vienna, Louis XIV. suspended his operations against the Spaniards, saying, "I will never attack a Christian prince while Christendom is in danger from the infidels." With what amount of sincerity these words were uttered by the French king we need not inquire. I have quoted them merely because they seem to express a feeling very prevalent just now with thoughtful men, and which, in their case at all events, is sincere enough. They see that the foundations of the faith are brought into question, and that the battle rages round the Ark itself. And they not unnaturally wonder that those who, like Ritualists and their opponents, profess to hold in common the essentials of Christianity, cannot merge their lesser differences in its defence. If Ephraim (they think) would cease to envy Judah, and Judah forbear to vex Ephraim, the spoiling of the Philistines would make greater progress. And this is felt the more strongly because men look upon the contention about Ritualism as relating mainly to the degree of outward uniformity to be observed in public worship. And a rigid uniformity in outward matters is in itself alien from the temper of the age. We pride ourselves on looking everywhere beneath the surface of things, in being disciples of the spirit and not of the letter, in detecting the deeper unities which underlie apparent diversities.

We cannot wonder, therefore, if men cry out that to attach much importance either way to ceremonial details, when weightier matters press for a hearing, shows a narrow and bigoted mind.

II. Now the answer to all this, so far as the case of the Ritualists is concerned, lies, as I conceive, mainly, in a direct denial that it is a mere question of ceremonial details at all. The opponents of Ritualism would use the same language as

would be used by a minister of state when justifying restrictions upon liberty at a time of national danger. If pressed by the common-places about the rights of the subject and the tyranny of minute and vexatious interference, a minister so situated would reply that things small in themselves become important when they are known to be overt acts done in pursuance of a common purpose inimical to the constitution of the country. He would say that when a combination is proved to exist for the carrying out of such a purpose, restrictions which at other times might well be suffered to lie dormant, must be enforced as the only available means of averting the common danger. A great and perilous movement may chance to be amenable to the law only in some indirect form, and upon what an uninformed person would call a mere bye-point. The technical charge by which it is brought before the court may in no degree express to the mind of a common reader the real nature or extent of the evil. He may even be tempted to speak of it as a petty and unworthy proceeding. But the statesman knows that, as on a comparatively small field the fate of empires may be fought out, so on that narrow issue may depend the result of a vast struggle between those who maintain and those who would overthrow the constitution.

But it will be said—this is all plausible enough, but when we come back from politics to Church matters, where is the proof of such a dangerous combination against our Ecclesiastical Constitution? Let us first consider what we have to show in order to prove our case. We have to establish,

III. (1.) That the details of ceremonial, which in themselves appear trivial, really derive magnitude from being acts done in the prosecution of an important purpose.

(2.) That this purpose is common to a number of persons combined together to carry it out.

(3.) That this purpose is one hostile to the maintenance of the great settlement of the Church of England at the time of our national Reformation.

On none of these heads is the evidence far to seek—"Habemus confitentes reos."

IV. Thus as regards the first point, we find in the 'Directorium

Anglicanum' (Preface, p. xiv., Second Edition) that Ritual and Ceremonial "are the expressions of doctrine, and witnesses to the Sacramental system of the Catholic religion." And another witness to the like purpose is Dr. Littledale, who, in the first series of 'The Church and the World,' p. 30, writes thus:—

"Now that the ground has been to some extent cleared, by stating the opinions current outside the Tractarian ranks as to the character and value of the ritual observance which prevails within them, it is fitting to put forward the view which the Ritualists themselves hold; and the reasons which seem to them to justify it. There are two factors which go to make up the sum of their proceedings, to wit, dogma and practical expediency. As this is not a theological treatise, it will suffice to say of the former that Ritual is in some sort the visible exponent of particular tenets which are more or less prevalent in the Church of England, and which could not be dislodged from their position without a schism in the present, and an irreparable breach with the past . . . it is only when the dogmatic system taught by the great Tractarian leaders has made itself realized as a living creed, that ceremonial worship has become practicable or intelligible."

In weighing the force of these words it must not be forgotten that the writer of them appears to be the great authority with Ritualists on liturgical questions, and his opinions may therefore be taken to be those of his school generally.*

Coming next to the Evidence given before the Ritual Commission, we find the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett asked (Quest. 2774), "Do you think it is part of the Church arrangement t' at the ceremonial should be suitable to the doctrine?"

Ans. "Exactly."

"If there was any change made by the Church in the doctrine, there would naturally be a change in the ceremonial?"

Ans. "Exactly; or the ceremonial would have no more meaning."

But we may perhaps look for the fullest statement in an Essay written expressly on 'The Symbolism of Ritual,' by the Rev. C. J. Le Geyt, in the second series of 'The Church and the World.' We there read as follows:—

* See Evidence before the Ritual Commission, questions 2139, 2241, and 'Direct. Angl.,' 2nd edit., Preface, p. xxviii., and p. xxxii. et alibi.

"The chief point and value of all Ritual is, that it symbolizes and expresses, and at the same time enshrines and protects, Dogmatic Truth. Ritualists, so called, have no desire to escape under the guise of harmless non-entities. Ritual unquestionably does symbolize doctrine, and therefore has been so carefully legislated for by the Church." (p. 549.)

And, giving an instance of what is meant, he says, "The Ritual of the Church, therefore, provides that the Priest *stands* at the altar—the position of sacrifice—to signify his office as vicegerent of, and substitute for, our Lord Himself, Who in truth here offers Himself, and is offered by the hands of the Priest; fulfilling thus continually His office as High Priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedec, which order consisted principally in this, that he offered up Bread and Wine in sacrifice." . . . . "Where the rule of the Church is violated, and the Priest *kneels* to exercise his Office, he fails to express the nature of his prerogative, and to exhibit, for the edification of the faithful, the due 'ministration' of his Priesthood. For the same reason the Priest is robed for the Eucharistic sacrifice in vestments to which symbolical meaning has been attached, signifying the representative character of the Priest." (p. 551.)

It would be a waste of time to adduce any further evidence, of which there is abundance in the works of all Ritualist authors. It may be hoped that enough has been done to show how completely mistaken those persons are who affect to treat the whole question as one of a little more or less splendour and decoration in public worship. The subject of the accessories of Divine Service, looked at from an æsthetic point of view, or in the light of religious expediency, as tending to warm and quicken the sentiment of devotion, is no doubt one of great interest. But with the present controversy in its principal and more important aspect it has nothing to do. Mr. Bennett puts this most clearly. He is asked (in relation to the vestments) by the Commissioners (Quest. 2978) "You do not contend, then, for any æsthetic purpose, but strictly for a doctrinal purpose?"

Ans. "Decidedly. The æsthetic purpose forms an accident afterwards, but is not the object."

"The object is to convey religious impressions, and to guard religious doctrine?"

Ans. "Yes."

The result is, that the rites, gestures, and ceremonies, on which so much stress is laid, have been introduced with a deliberate purpose of promoting the reception of certain principles which they are considered to express. They are acts done in furtherance of that purpose. Their magnitude and importance are to be determined, not in reference to themselves, but in reference to the object which they are made to promote.

Circumcision, St. Paul expressly assures us, "is nothing, neither uncircumcision" (1 Cor. vii. 19); yet in another place his words are, "I say to every man that is among you that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing" (Gal. v. 2). That which in itself was unimportant, became in its symbolic and ceremonial aspect a matter which he could not denounce too strongly.

The same principles prevail in judicial procedure. A password or sign of an illegal association may be some expression or action of the most trivial character, and men may think it beneath notice if they dwell on it as it is in itself, and keep out of sight its relation to something behind. But an intelligent Judge and Jury are not thus misled. Like the symbols of algebra, such things take their value from that for which they stand.

Not merely, therefore, are the external acts of Ritualism means of promoting the spread of the dogmas with which they are associated, but, if allowed to prevail, they must inevitably come to be an argument that those dogmas are held by the Church; otherwise (it will be said) she would not have permitted the outward acts which testify to and express them.

V. It is time that we should go to the second point, viz., that the purpose which the outward acts of Ritualism are intended to subserve is one common to a large party who are combined to carry it out.

Little proof on this head will be needed by those who have witnessed the admirable organisation by which Ritualists are mustered, whenever a display of their numbers and strength is requisite, or the tone which on such occasions their newspapers and periodicals assume, communicating the *mot d'ordre* as the recognised organs of a great party.

But if evidence be needful, none better can be given than

the declarations made by an influential society, which boasts of the existence of such a combination, and assumes to wield its forces.

The English Church Union, as we learn from an address delivered by its President in 1866, was founded in 1859. Its results, as regards the "Church party," are thus stated:—

"The disunion which was too apparent in 1859 is now no longer visible, and in place of it we have a *large and growing and well-compacted body*, becoming daily more and more *formidable* in its proportions and influence." And we are bid to remember "that the very existence of such a body as this Society is a *power* of itself, even if it be quiescent; for the influence which emanates from it, *the policy of which it is the symbol*, and *the force* which is generated at its centre, constitute alone an effective instrument, with God's blessing, for advancing the sacred cause all have combined to promote."*

A tolerably distinct notion of what its operations are is to be gathered from the Report of the Union for the year 1866-7:—

"In the last Annual Report several suits were alluded to as in progress, in reference to which the President and Council are glad to report that the threatened proceedings against the Rev. J. W. Coope, Rector of Falmouth, for the use of altar-lights, have not been initiated; and that another clergyman of the same diocese, who had also been *ordered by the Archdeacon* to discontinue an ornament, which, *in the opinion of the President and Council*, was strictly legal, has also been left in peace, after receiving *a promise of protection from the Union*. Of the cases finally decided, or still in progress, which may be mentioned as having occurred since the last Report, the President and Council would record that of the Incumbent of Folkestone, who almost immediately after the satisfactory termination of the legal proceedings instituted *on his behalf* by the Union, under circumstances detailed in the last Report, found himself again under the necessity of seeking help from the Society, to enable him to put a stop to a system of annoyance and persecution carried on

* Address delivered at the annual meeting of the English Church Union, June 14, 1866, by the Hon. Colin Lindsay, the President. London, 1866. The italics in the above and in the next quotation are mine.

by the Editor of a local paper.* It is hardly necessary to say that the President and Council at once gave the assistance required, the result being the insertion of a most complete and ample apology for having written what appeared to be libellous and injurious charges and imputations, and a very satisfactory alteration in the general tone of the paper in discussing Mr. Woodward's proceedings. *Many cases of a somewhat similar kind* have been brought under the notice of the President and Council during the past year, and have received their careful consideration; but as the majority of them have been arranged without any expense to the Society, it is unnecessary to submit any detailed account. Several serious cases of aggression on the part of hostile churchwardens and other officers of the Church have also occurred during the past year: one being the case of the Incumbent of a small living, whose churchwarden possessed himself of the keys of the church, and insisted on his right to retain them, depriving the clergyman of all control of the church. This case having been brought under the notice of the President and Council, they directed the Proctor to institute proceedings in the Consistory Court, which resulted in the establishment of the rights of the clergyman. Another case, which is still in progress, is that of a clergyman in the West of England, who found it necessary to seek the aid of the Union in consequence of the outrageous conduct of the parish bell-ringers, who (probably instigated by persons in a higher rank of life) had insisted upon their right to ring the bells at their pleasure, without reference to the Incumbent, and in the exercise of that supposed right had broken open the door of the belfry. All remonstrances proving to be vain, the President and Council directed the necessary steps to be taken for the restoration of the Incumbent's rights, and have little doubt of a satisfactory result. Of another class of cases, two may be submitted by way of illustration—one being that of a clergyman in Norfolk, who incurred the displeasure of his Bishop. *The President and Council*, acting under the advice of the Hon. Proctor, recommended that the choral service, *and other matters objected to by the Diocesan, should not be discontinued; and offered to defend*

* It will be observed that the interference of the Society extends to the public press, and to a class of questions involving civil rights and cognisable by the secular courts.

the Priest, if legal proceedings were taken against him. They are happy to be able to report that the Bishop did not institute proceedings, and they were therefore not called upon for material assistance. In another similar case, where the *increase of Ritual* had also increased considerably the congregation and communicants, *the Council felt bound to advise the Rector not to alienate his parishioners by acceding to the unreasonable and illegal demands of the Bishop:* and here, too, the Priest was allowed to remain unmolested, *in consequence of the support which it was known the Union was prepared to afford.* The President and Council have reason to believe that the knowledge of their readiness to maintain the rights and liberties of the Parochial Clergy has not only stayed attacks already begun, but also, in very many instances, prevented them from being commenced."—Report, p. 10.

I am not now concerned to express any opinion whether such an organisation as this be expedient or inexpedient, nor to compare it with any association on the other side of the question. I simply exhibit the fact of its existence, in order that it may be seen to enhance the public importance of the system which it protects and carries forward. There are many acts in secular matters which may be done by individuals with impunity, but which when done by a number of persons, in prosecution of a common object, draw down the notice of the law. This shows the importance attached by public authority to any kind of combination; and proves that deeds in themselves of small moment assume at once a magnitude and significance when they are the fruit of union and concert. And the Report which has just been quoted distinctly avows that no Bishop will be permitted to attempt to restrain any practices which find favour with "the President and Council," without being opposed by the whole force of the Union, backed by funds derived from its five thousand subscribers.

It is true, no doubt, that the Union professes to act on the defensive alone, and to defend the threatened liberties of the clergy. But it must be recollected that the liberty in question consists in a supposed right to introduce ceremonies which may or may not be of ancient origin, but which are for all practical purposes unheard-of novelties in the customary system of Divine worship. This being so, such interference is

apt to be regarded by most men as very like assuming the offensive.*

'VI. I now pass to the most vital part of the subject—which is, the proof that the aim of this powerful combination is nothing less than the overturning of the Reformation settlement. We all remember the saying of Mr. R. H. Froude, more than thirty years ago—"The Reformation was a limb badly set—it must be broken again in order to be righted." † At the time, such expressions as these were attributed to the heated temperament of the individual writer, and were not unreservedly adopted by the school to which he belonged. But in the history of the Ritualist movement, the developments have been regular and rapid; sentiments and practices have been successively put forward, which at first were judged extravagant and all but repudiated, by the party generally; then, were defended as legitimate subjects of discussion; and finally were accepted as an undoubted platform from which to make further advances. Unlike other movements, therefore, Ritualism must ever be judged by its most extreme partisans; for within a short space of time the party is certain to raise itself to their level. This has been notably the case with respect to the statements just cited. At first much respect was professed for the older English Divines, such as Hooker. Then it was found that the theology of the Elizabethan age, and even of that of James I., was by no means in harmony with that of Ritualism. It became necessary, therefore, to confine the period of Anglican orthodoxy within narrow limits. Laud and the Caroline Divines were supposed alone to afford the true type; and those who took part in the revision of the Prayer-book at the Restoration, were deemed, by what they then effected, to have purged the Church from the evil leaven of the early Reformers. It would appear, however, that this last refuge is now failing, that this platform, which it was hoped was firm, though narrow, is felt to be giving way. The

* "I must repeat what I have often said, that I cannot but consider that the Ritualist party, in embracing these views, have made themselves the aggressors. They have taken a very decided step in advance; they have done what none of their predecessors have done for 200 years past, and have thereby provoked the animosity and wounded the feelings of their brethren who did not share their sentiments." Speech of Archbishop of Canterbury in Convocation, February 19, 1868.—*Chronicle of Convocation*, Sessions of February, 1868, pp. 1137-1138.

† Froude's 'Remains,' vol. i. p. 433.

'Church Times,' after having long ago given up Cranmer and Ridley, and denied them the title of martyrs, on the ground that on the testimony of their own works they appear not to have died for the truth—has now found it needful to disavow the Caroline writers. In a remarkable passage in the number for January 25th, 1868, it says:—

"The plain fact is that the modern Tractarian school accepts all that is positive in the writings of the Anglo-Catholic Divines of the 17th century, and rejects the negative part."

In other words, it rejects, I presume, their protests against Rome, which form the principal negative part of their teaching; and this being so, one does not see why a Roman Catholic writer might not use the very same words as this Ritualist organ. The article proceeds to assign the cause why these "great men" . . "failed to impress their opinions on any large or powerful body of lay supporters;"—and it is, "Because they endeavoured to prove a part to be greater than the whole; the narrow Anglican communion to be the mistress, pattern, and judge of the Catholic Church of all ages; because they obscured the Faith with pedantry, and overwhelmed it with logomachy."

Lord Macaulay himself has hardly used harsher words against Laud and his followers. There is, it seems, no contumely too great to be heaped on a broken idol. In fact, the writers of the 17th century have not been disavowed until it was high time to disavow them. Nothing is more conspicuous among Ritualist authors than their emphatic repudiation of the term Protestant. Nothing is more clear than that no such aversion to the word prevailed at the period in question. Taking Laud as the highest type of the school, we find him expressly using it with his latest breath.

"Nay, my Lords" (he says when on his trial), "I am as innocent in this business of religion, as free from all practice, or so much as thought of practice for any alteration to Popery, or any way blemishing the true Protestant religion established in the Church of England, as I was when my mother first bare me into the world." And he takes credit to himself for the number of persons whom by God's blessing upon his labours he has "settled in the true Protestant religion established in England."—(Hargrave's 'State Trials,' vol. i. p. 844, Edit. 1776.)

In fact, the admission is gradually coming out, not only that no great school of English Divines since the Reformation really represents the tenets of Ritualism, but that the Church itself, as it stands, is not the expression of those tenets. The latter of these assertions, though often made by their opponents, has hitherto for the most part been strenuously denied by Ritualist writers. But it would seem that the scene is changing.

The anonymous author of 'A Companion to the Book of Common Prayer' (London, 1867), says:—"We do certainly consider that a reformation of our Church is needed," and wishes to see it "accomplished by lawful authority." (p. 10.)

And Dr. Littledale (who, as I have already said, is so continually put forward as the Coryphæus of Ritualists on Liturgical questions, that he may fairly be treated as a representative writer), in a letter to the Archbishop on 'Catholic Revision,' speaks in similar language:—"The silence of the High Church party has" (he tells us) "been explained to denote their complete and perfect satisfaction with the Common Prayer-book as it stands;" but this, it now appears, is an erroneous conclusion. "In fact" (he says), "we are sensible that the Common Prayer-book can be regarded only as a minimum, and that a very scanty one. There are some truths, part of the common heritage of Christendom, which it dilutes, others which it obscures, others, again, which it entirely passes over. The traces of the spoiler's violence are too plainly visible in defacement and mutilation to escape remark, and fresh maiming is more than it could survive." (p. 6.)

In regard to the Communion Office in particular, he writes:—

"It is impossible for any English Liturgical scholar to behold it in its present condition and to compare it with the glorious rite of Sarum, or even with Edward VI.'s First Book, without being bowed down with shame, grief, and indignation, at the enormous wrong-doing which was perpetrated, and the apathy with which it has been so long regarded. True it is that some little recovery took place in 1662, but very much remains to be done before we can obliterate the scars of past mutilation." (p. 21).

It can hardly be necessary to remind the reader that the Sarum Office here praised so highly is that which was in use before the Reformation, and was the expression of those doctrines

from which it has usually been supposed that the Reformers happily delivered us.

Coming to the Visitation of the Sick, Dr. Littledale observes that this office "as it stands, is a body without a soul. It is only a framework to receive the rite of unction, which is not only apostolic (S. James, v. 14) but divine (S. Mark, vi. 13). None of the specious pleas put forward by Anglican controversialists in defence or extenuation of the sin of our Church in abolishing a rite maintained by the Catholic Church of East and West alike, are of the slightest cogency, and till we recover this grievous fall we have no right to censure the Roman Church for withholding one-half of a rite from the laity, while we deny the whole of another to priest and people alike." (p. 29.)

In the service for the Burial of the Dead, he proposes the restoration of an office "with express prayer for the dead in it" (p. 29); and in a subsequent pamphlet* he argues that "the now popular heresy of denial of the eternity of punishment is the direct and natural consequence of thrusting the purgatorial doctrine of the Catholic Church out of sight."

As regards additional services, he asks (*inter alia*) for an office for the reception of a convert to the Church from some form of dissent. "The old Irish Common Prayer-book," he says, "contains one for the reception of persons leaving the Roman Communion, thus recognizing the principle, but it does not provide for the far *more* frequent and *desirable* case of *abandonment of Protestantism*, now, thank God, of occurrence many times daily amongst the people."† And as regards confession, "now that" it "is eagerly sought by thousands," he suggests that "it is desirable that the mode of hearing it, and of administering Absolution, should be formally laid down. The Sarum Use provides one, and it might be expanded from the Ritual of Milan, as reformed by the illustrious S. Carlo Borromeo." Again, "The recognized consecration of chrism and holy oil for various rites cannot be much longer postponed. It will certainly come in somehow,‡ and on all grounds it is far better,

---

* Second letter to the Archbishop on 'Additional Services,' see p. 19.

† The italics are mine.

‡ These words are specially characteristic of the writer's school. Here, as elsewhere, Ritualists adopt a tone towards the rulers of the Church which of itself goes far to prove the existence, power, and designs of such an organisation as I have described.

for the Episcopate to take the initiative, and to keep the usage, as heretofore, in its own hands."—'Additional Services,' p. 28.

Et sic de ceteris. Instead of further details, I will merely add one more quotation of a general nature respecting the character of those whom we have been accustomed to call the Fathers of the Reformation. Those who admire a great work, will speak with charity and discrimination even of the weak points of those who accomplished it. Those who hate the work, and would fain overthrow it, however carefully they may attempt to disguise such an intention, will usually betray themselves by their harshness and injustice towards the doers of it.

Dr. Littledale says of those whom he calls "the self-styled Reformers,"—"Their scriptural models were not David, who set the singers in order, and accumulated treasures for the House of God; nor Solomon, who dedicated the Temple and its rich contents; nor yet Judas Maccabæus, who cleansed and purified the profaned holy places. They aimed rather at rivalling Nebuchadnezzar, who burnt Solomon's noble structure to the ground—do not Tintern and Fountain's, Reading and Glastonbury, S. Edmund's and Croyland, and scores of others, tell an even worse tale?—at imitating Belshazzar, who turned the hallowed vessels into instruments for drunken revelry; at surpassing Antiochus Epiphanes, who set up the Abomination of Desolation in the Holy Place. No wonder they dared not reproduce the Pontifical. Every page would have borne testimony against their unspeakable wickedness, and thus it has been a blank to our day. A Pontifical put forth when Ridley was hewing down God's altars,* when Barlow was stealing the lead from the roof of his Cathedral, to embezzle its price, when Purfew had stripped S. Asaph of its wealth to spend it in riotous living, and Cranmer and Coverdale were helping the

* The reader will observe the connection in which this act (an act solemnly decided to be in harmony with the mind of the Reformed Church by the Judicial Committee in Westerton *v.* Liddell, *see* 'Moore's Report,' p. 181 *et seq.*) is placed by this author, and the deeds with which it is put on a par. Into the truth of his other accusations this is not the place to enter. My sole point is that the *animus* of the writer and his school towards the Reformation comes out in the tendency exhibited to ignore the virtues, and to dwell upon and enhance the alleged errors of the Reformers, on all occasions. This tendency has been emphatically rebuked by the Ecclesiastical Court in a previous instance. See the words of Sir H. J. Fust, 1 Robertson, 348.

Royal Commissioners to plunder the plate and jewels of the churches, would have been a mockery indeed! Now that, by the Divine blessing, we have grace to avoid their example, and that we are trying, however feebly, to remedy part of their evil doing, we may well correct this amongst other things." (p. 27.)*

But perhaps the complete alienation of Ritualists from the principles of the Reformation can scarcely be better shewn than by the simple fact that one of their divines has written a work called 'The Kiss of Peace,' to shew that the doctrine of the Church of England, on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is identical with that of the Church of Rome. Few persons will be disposed to agree in his conclusion, but the book remains a lasting evidence how far the writer must have departed from the tenets of those whom the Romish clergy (who must be presumed to understand their own doctrines) put to death for heresy on this very point. That some members of the school to which he belongs have indeed diverged widely from the Church of the Reformation appears no less from their books of devotion than from their theological treatises.

The 'Little Prayer-book' is a work "intended for beginners in devotion." It has, we are informed, "been revised and corrected by three Priests," and may be presumed to have received the approbation of the party, as it has reached its fifth thousand. It contains a "Litany of the most Holy Sacrament," in which this invocation is found,—

"Bread made flesh by the omnipotence of the Word,

. . . . . .

Have mercy upon us."

And again,—

"By Thy precious Blood, which Thou hast left us on our altars,
We sinners beseech Thee to hear us."

In the same work the directions to communicants are:

"Kneel upright at the altar, and when the priest comes to you hold the palm of your right hand open and your left hand

* I have quoted this pamphlet in order to show the lengths to which the party are prepared to go: but so far as it is an indication of future legislative changes to be publicly and openly wrought, it is fair enough. What I am seeking in this paper to draw attention to, as far more dangerous, is the determined though gradual introduction of the most important changes as a mere matter of practice by the officiating Clergy, without public sanction for the alteration.

crossed under it: be most careful to receive into your mouth all, even the smallest Portion, of the Most Holy Sacrament, since one Crumb or Drop of It is worth more than the world itself."

In 'The Altar Manual,' edited "by a Committee of Clergy" (Palmer, 1867), we are told:

"Upon their [the priests'] pronouncing the words 'THIS IS MY BODY,' 'THIS IS MY BLOOD,' in the prayer of consecration, the Holy Ghost comes down upon the elements of Bread and Wine, and they become 'verily and indeed' the BODY and BLOOD OF CHRIST. The outward elements of Bread and Wine do not cease to be what they were before, but they *become* what they were not before; even as in the beginning 'God breathed the breath of life,' into that body of clay which He had created, and 'man *became* a living soul' (Gen. ii. 7), and as in the Incarnation the Word became Flesh, and two natures were united in One Person, without 'confusion of substance.'" (p. 4).

Accordingly we are told "we ought to receive the Sacrament *fasting*. Natural reverence would teach us that the BODY and BLOOD OF CHRIST should be the first food that entered our mouth on the day of our Communion."

In a tract called 'Devotions for those who are present at the Eucharistic sacrifice without communicating,' also "edited by a Committee of Clergy" (seventeenth thousand), Palmer, 1867, a hymn is inserted to be used after the consecration, in which these words occur,—

> "Word made Flesh, the bread of nature
> By His Word to Flesh He turns;
> Wine into His Blood He changes,
> What though sense no change discerns?
> Only be the heart in earnest,
> Faith her lesson quickly learns."

In 'A Companion to the Book of Common Prayer' (Palmer, 1867, 2nd edition, p. 30) we read as to the elements: "If any remain that is consecrated, it is ordered that the Priest shall *reverently* eat and drink the same: no such provision is made with respect to the baptismal water, because there the 'inward and spiritual grace is *spiritual*, not *corporal*,'" [the italics are in the original,] "and exists only in the act of administration." And in 'Tracts for the Day' (Longman, 1868), at p. 76 of the Tract on 'The Seven Sacraments,' we find it said of the

Eucharist,—"There is another striking difference between this Sacrament and the others. In other Sacraments the outward matter or Form is merely the instrument to convey a benediction or confer a grace. In this the outward Form itself becomes the Thing signified, in a manner wholly beyond the powers of the natural understanding to comprehend. As the WORD became Flesh by conception in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, so these Elements *become* [sic in orig.] the Body and Blood of CHRIST by consecration."

That the like is the case with the organs of Ritualism in the newspaper press, we have room to shew but by a single instance:

"The only result of these proceedings" [the various efforts made against the Ritualists], "therefore, has been to advertise the faith, and to lead to its acceptance by all that can appreciate sound reasoning, and by all in whose hearts there is the smallest instinctive feeling for the truth of God. Where there was one person that believed in the Sacrifice of the Mass when the Round Church was restored at Cambridge, there are now a thousand." ('Church Times,' Feb. 1, 1868).

Perhaps, however, instead of prolonging the series of quotations, it will be best simply to cite the opinion of the Archbishop of Canterbury, whose known moderation of opinion and gentleness of temper would not have allowed of his expressing himself so strongly without cause. The speech from which I am about to give an extract, was delivered in Convocation, and is reported in the 'Chronicle of Convocation Sessions,' Feb. 1868, p. 1138.

"I do not wish to curtail the liberty so long enjoyed by the Church of England: I do not wish to impair the liberty alluded to by my right rev. friend the Bishop of Ely, and I believe that the vast majority of the Church, its consistent friends and adherents, would not desire anything beyond what they find they enjoy within its pale. But to much that is going on it is impossible for any one to lend any sanction or approval. I will quote something which has occurred within my own special cognizance; we all know the proceedings that are now common, and that statements are constantly made which abundantly prove that there are many who are determined to obliterate from our articles and formularies all traces of the Reformation.

I said I would mention something that had occurred in my own diocese. I had a letter from a parent living at the sea-side, in the hands of whose daughter was placed an Eucharistic Manual which contained these words: they are a prayer at the Holy Communion, after the consecration of the elements,—

"'Holy Father, accept the spotless victim, which thy servant offers for his own sake and those of all faithful Christians both living and dead, that it may make us worthy of everlasting life.'

"Now contrast that with our Thirty-first Article.

(His Grace quoted it.)

"Put these two side by side and I do not think any one can venture to say they are not diametrically opposed to each other. Now a very large majority of the members of the Church of England do believe that the Ritualist practices favour the acceptance of these doctrines. You may try to persuade them they are wrong, but it will be very difficult to do so, and I think my right rev. brethren must admit the grave consequences which must follow the adoption of these views. As those who hold them seem determined to retain them, surely it is consistent with the dignity of this house to take some measures which would facilitate the means of checking them."

We have it, therefore, on the authority of the Archbishop, that what are known as Ritualistic practices stand in close connection with a design to obliterate all traces of the Reformation. And this is precisely the case which I have been seeking to establish.

VII. Nor should it be forgotten in considering such questions as those discussed in this paper, how needful it is to take into account the peculiar constitution of the Church of England. Speaking in the abstract, there are obviously two distinct schemes by which the rights of the Church at large may be protected against any encroachment on the part of the clerical order. On the one hand, liberal and expansive powers may be given, subject to the proviso that the consent of the whole Church is to be indispensable in order to their exercise. On the other hand, the whole, or nearly the whole, power for practical purposes may be placed in the hands of the Clergy alone, and yet the domain for its exercise be so restricted by

positive enactment, that, so long as the prescribed limits are not transgressed, no considerable infraction of the liberties of the Church can take place. The latter plan of course involves a certain statutory rigidity of system, which, contradictory as it may appear to a certain class of minds, is in such a case not a form of tyranny, but a guarantee for freedom. It is hardly necessary to say that our English Ecclesiastical Constitution is framed in a great degree upon the second of these plans. The Clergyman has the sole direction of public worship. The members of the congregation have no power to interfere, nor, so long as he keeps within the law, can they in ordinary cases make their voice heard with success even in the way of complaint. Moreover, a Parochial Minister has the exclusive cure of souls within the bounds of the parish, and (unless in some very exceptional cases) no other church can be erected, nor can any other Clergyman administer the Sacraments, or even preach or deliver doctrine publicly there without his consent. These are large prerogatives, and the only safeguard provided against their abuse is the minuteness with which the law of the Church lays down the duties of this highly privileged person. Whether such a constitution be the best that could be devised, or whether it might be altered with advantage, is a subject on which different speculative opinions will no doubt be held. The practical point is, that it is the constitution under which we at present live. And to speak of liberty under this scheme of government, as consisting in the relaxation of restrictions and the concession of large discretionary powers to the clerical body, seems to be to misapprehend, in a very main degree, the leading idea of the whole system.

VIII. But the force of all arguments tending to shew that it is time to restrain Ritualist variations from uniformity, is supposed to be broken by the fact that variations also take place on the part of other Clergy who belong to an opposite school of theology. It is said that we cannot interfere with some without interfering with all; and a theory of this kind would appear to have found a remarkable degree of acceptance, not merely with casual observers, but with very exalted authorities. As a rather prominent example (though but one out of many that might be given) I will cite what took place not very long ago in an English diocese. This will afford an occasion of examining

the theory on its merits, and considering generally the foundations on which it rests.

In August, 1867, a memorial was addressed to a Prelate of great theological attainments by upwards of 9000 lay members of the Church of England, expressing their deep concern at "the introduction into many of the churches of the land of an elaborate Ritualism, Romish vestments, altar lights and incense, in avowed connection with doctrines which cannot be well distinguished from transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass."

And they go on to say, "We feel that the time has fully come to express our determination as far as in us lies to maintain the Protestant doctrine of our own Reformed Church, in relation to this subject, as set forth in the twenty-eighth and thirty-first Articles; and the prescribed form of worship as plainly laid down in the Prayer-book; and we dare not, by our silence, be parties to the present attempts on the part of some of the Clergy to restore doctrines and practices deliberately rejected by the Church at the Reformation. We are convinced that your Lordship entirely disapproves of the practices and doctrines of which we complain, and we earnestly hope that your Lordship may be able to take such steps as will not only prevent their further extension in this diocese, but also their continuance where they have been introduced."

The Bishop in his reply says,—

"I sympathise with 'the deep concern with which' the memorialists 'view the introduction into many of the churches of the land of an elaborate ritualism, Romish vestments, altar lights, and incense, in avowed connexion with doctrines which cannot be well distinguished from transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass.'

"My own feeling is against the use of lighted candles in the daytime. But, as I had occasion to remark in replying to a previous memorial, conflicting opinions, as to their legality, have been given by eminent lawyers; and we must await a declaration of the law from the Ecclesiastical Court into which this question has been carried.

"With regard to another head of your complaint, I have received assurance from the Clergy to whom, doubtless, the memorialists refer, that these practices were abandoned, in compliance with the expression of my disapproval.

"I am desirous, as any of the memorialists can be, to maintain the doctrine of our Reformed Church, as set forth in the 28th and 31st Articles; and the prescribed form of worship, as plainly laid down in the Prayer-book.

"But this prescribed form of worship must be maintained in its integrity, if it is to be maintained in its purity. If one school of thought in our Church could be induced to give up its extravagancies, and the other would be more hearty and exact in compliance with the directions of the rubric, all might alike offer the prayer that we might hold the faith in unity of spirit and in the bond of peace with a clearer conscience and a better hope of acceptance."*

This last paragraph would convey, I think, to most minds, and therefore is, I presume, meant to convey, the impression that both parties are to a certain extent *in pari delicto*, and that the memorialists did not come with clean hands to complain of "extravagancies," if they sympathised with or tolerated a want of hearty and exact compliance with the rubric in members of their own school.

Such words, coming from a learned prelate and theologian, deserve careful consideration.

In the first place, there is some difficulty in seeing how the parties who presented the address could be responsible for the deviations from uniformity of any school of clergy, seeing that as laymen they had no part in the performance of public worship. It does not appear clear, therefore, how they could be liable to an *argumentum ad hominem* of this character, whatever might be its validity as addressed to clergymen.

But in the next place, it is submitted with great deference that the grievances set forth in the memorial were not complained of *quà* deviations from uniformity, or as what the Bishop calls "extravagancies." What the memorial charges in substance is an attempt "to restore doctrines and practices deliberately rejected by the Church at the Reformation;" and the "extravagancies" in question are relied on as evidence of the *animus* of the parties against whom this complaint is brought. As mere departures from rubrical exactness, apart

* These extracts have been made from the 'Memorial and Correspondence,' as published at the time in the 'Liverpool Daily Courier.'

from their significance on the question of intention, there is nothing to show that the memorialists would have felt so strongly about them. Hence it is not easy to see the justice of drawing a parallel between the case disclosed by the address, and any shortcomings in rubrical exactness merely as such.

The Bishop, in framing the paragraph under consideration, was no doubt moved by a desire to act, and was probably under the impression that he was acting, in a spirit of equitable impartiality. But it may be allowable to express a doubt whether the requirements of such a spirit were altogether what his Lordship seems to have supposed. For impartiality, even in its judicial sense—the impartiality of a court of law compelled to come to some decision on every one of the matters brought before it—does not consist in treating all offences as equal, but in duly estimating the importance of each on its proper grounds. And if this be so even with a judge, it is still more the case when, as here, the question is not so much judicial as administrative. For the appeal was made to the Bishop, as a governor exercising the executive power of the Church; and the real point was, whether the cases of the two schools of theology were so nearly on a par that no valid distinction could be drawn between them, and that no steps could fairly be taken on one side without a necessity to take them also on the other.

Now in this point of view, it is submitted that it is not usually considered indispensable, for the sake of impartiality, that a government should decline to interfere in a pressing case, because some minor evil happens not to have been effectually redressed. Thus, to take rather a strong instance, the authorities did not think it incumbent on them to inquire whether due punishment had been awarded to all street boys who had let off squibs on the 5th of November, before they determined to prosecute the parties who fired the barrel at Clerkenwell.

So again, the Attorney-General does not ask whether every hot-headed speaker has been strictly called to account, before he takes proceedings for sedition or treason-felony against men who deliberately conspire to preach disaffection.

Even where offences are committed against the same statute, they are not necessarily of equal importance. What would be

thought of Commissioners of Police or Magistrates if they declined to enforce the Metropolitan Police Act against persons provoking a breach of the peace, or driving furiously to the danger of life, or being intoxicated and riotous,* on the ground that the complainant happened to be guilty of having his doormat shaken after the hour of eight in the morning, or did not sufficiently cleanse the footway before his house?†

These are extreme cases, no doubt, and I deprecate the supposition that I mean to compare Ritualists, or their opponents, to these respective classes of offenders. But it is by extreme cases that the soundness of a principle is tested, and I am only using a logical right in so testing the principle before us.

Let it then be carefully noted that the question is, not whether any departure from the rubric is to be advocated and justified—(a position of a wholly different kind)—but whether, looking on the subject dispassionately and in a judicial temper, there is really any fair comparison to be drawn between the proceedings of Ritualists and the irregularities attributed to their opponents. Because, if not, a rigorous enforcement of the law against every small variation from it might possibly be to fall into that very bondage to the letter—that very system of inelastic uniformity—which, as stated at the commencement of this paper, is peculiarly distasteful to the spirit of our times. To enforce a stern code as the only means of dealing with a powerful combination is one thing; to enforce the same code to crush every deviation from the smallest article of it is quite another thing. It is not usual for a prudent government to confound the two, or to conceive that they cannot take the former course without first settling how far it is expedient to adopt the latter also. On the contrary, a sound policy deals at once and vigorously with what is actually dangerous, and leaves minor questions for subsequent settlement, or allows them to settle themselves.

IX. It may be said, however, that we have no right to assume that the sins of the Low-Church party are of the comparatively venial kind now suggested. Let us therefore look at the point more closely. We have examined the nature and *animus* of

* See 2 and 3 Vict. c. 47, § 60. † Ibid., § 54.

Ritualism; let us now consider whether the characteristics of Low-Church departures from the rubric present like or unlike features.

And first, these departures cannot be called innovations. With scarcely any exception of importance, the services are performed by the Clergy of the school of which I am now speaking, in the manner common throughout the parochial churches of England at the beginning of this century and long previously. Be it that it is slovenly or unauthorised, still it is no novelty. It follows, therefore, that members of the school in question are not chargeable with having originated the acts or defaults spoken of; still less have they originated them as distinctive of their own party, or expressive of their peculiar views. If here and there any practice or omission appears to savour of a doctrinal peculiarity, it is, at all events, usually an isolated matter. There is little *unity* or *system* about the ritual deviations of Low Churchmen. They do not form a compact body, designed and put together for the direct purpose of giving outward expression to a system of dogmas. No controversial treatises have been written by theologians of this school laying down and advocating a detailed code of observance, or non-observance, as to matters of public worship, with a view to promote the reception of what are known as Low-Church tenets.

We must here distinguish (if we would come to an equitable decision) between what is introduced in order to express a dogma held by those who introduce it, and what by its introduction happens to offend against a dogma held by others. Evening Communions are a case in point. These, no doubt, give offence to the Ritualist school, and are not in harmony with their views as to the Lord's Supper; but they have not been introduced *in order* to promote an antagonistic view on the subject. Motives of convenience, and the desire of offering greater facilities to certain classes to communicate, appear to have led to the step. It does not seem to have been taken in the interest of a peculiar doctrinal system.

So again, the practice of saying the words of administration to more than one communicant at a time, is a usage, the source of which is to be traced to a desire to lessen the fatigue and length of the service where there are large Communions, rather

than to any tenet peculiar to those who adopt it. It has, no doubt, been alleged that it is due to Calvinistic opinions; but there is little doubt that this is an error, and that the number of clergymen who adhere to the custom for any such reason is infinitesimal.*

This point is the more worthy of notice, because if this school

* Supposing that the witnesses before the Ritual Commission were well chosen so as to be fair representatives of their schools, we find the evidence explicit on the points just mentioned.

The Rev. D. Wilson says, "I repeat the words once to each railful of communicants:" and adds, "when I first became vicar the sacrament was administered to every one or two persons. I was compelled by positive necessity to make a change. My health was not very strong; I very nearly fainted under the fatigue, and was compelled by the necessity of the case to do what your Grace is aware the Bishops are accustomed to do at the time of confirmation, the rubric being very nearly the same in reference to each. I was obliged by the necessities of the case to vary the mode of administration. I perhaps may be permitted to add, that, when the numbers are small, I quite feel that to administer to each individual is the correct and preferable plan. It is simply with me a matter of necessity."—*Ritual Commission Evidence*, No. 12.

And the Rev. E. Clay, being interrogated as to his ground for the same course, says:—"It is the ground of convenience. It would be almost impossible to administer to between 300 and 400 persons after a full service separately."—No. 3161.

As respects evening communions, Mr. Clay states his reason to be as follows:—"We have communion in the evening for the sake of the poor, the working classes, servants, and professional men (I mean specially now medical men, who, as you are aware, cannot attend morning service). It was desirable to try it. I tried it really as an experiment, but I found it succeed so marvellously, and it seemed to be so much appreciated, that I have continued it." Being asked if he had tried early morning communions, he says, "I did try, but I did not find anything like the same success. Certainly none of the poor attended."—Nos. 3114, 3115.

I am not giving any opinion as to the propriety of the usages here mentioned. I simply cite this evidence to show that they rest on a supposed ground of practical expediency, not on a dogmatic ground.

I subjoin two more extracts in proof of the statement that most irregularities with which the Low Church school are chargeable are not of their introduction, but have simply been continued as they were handed down from former days.

The Rev. D. Wilson says—"The point I was anxious to press with regard to the uniformity of practice in our parish was simply this, that during these hundred years, or nearly so, that is, during the time of Bishop Lowth, Bishop Porteus, Bishop Randolph, Bishop Howley, Bishop Blomfield, and your Lordship, the services have been conducted as they are now without any objection being made by the Ordinary for the time being."—No. 27.

Dean Close says of the services in Carlisle Cathedral—"They are conducted as they have been for the last hundred years; I cannot tell whether that is consistent with the rubrics or not; I took them as I found them, and I carried them on."—No. 1479.

I have not judged it necessary in this paper to say anything as to those of the Low Church school who seek for Liturgical revision, and for a plain reason. They seek to attain their object by legislation, which involves full notice and open discussion, and (if successful) the consent of the ruling powers.

The peculiarity of Ritualism is that it seeks to make what is equivalent to a vast legislative change, *without legislation*. It seeks by the mere will of a party to introduce and maintain vital alterations in the system of the Church without the sanction of competent authority. In other words, it contemplates revolution, not constitutional reform.

had been minded to act as the Ritualist school have done, in pressing into their service every rubric, the letter of which could be made to favour their views, though at the expense of recognised usage, they might have found a notable opportunity for so doing. At the commencement of the Communion Service it is directed that the Table at the Communion time "shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel, where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said." As in parish churches, prayers are said in the body of the church, it would seem that a strict conformity to this rubric requires the table to be moved from the chancel to the nave when there is a Communion. And it must not be forgotten that in the stone altar case, the Court of Arches laid stress on this rubric, and explained the motive, viz.—"that for the purpose of removing the superstition connected with the Popish mass, it (the Table) was to be movable, as the occasion might require."* It is clear, therefore, that a great opportunity here existed for the Low-Church school to make a demonstration in favour of their own views, and to give a blow to the sacredness attached by Ritualists to the "Sanctuary" or "Sacrarium," which is defined by the *Directorium Anglicanum* as "The most holy place enclosed by the altar rails." But such a step, however tempting in this view, would unquestionably have involved a considerable deviation from established custom, and would have offended the feelings of many. Accordingly the question has not been stirred; but the conduct of those whose interest it would have been to stir it, stands in marked contrast with that of the Ritualists in regard to the "ornament" rubric.† And here it may be worth observing that Dr. Littledale, in speaking of the Communion Service, treats "the liberty of removing the Holy Table," as "now practically abrogated."‡ He appears to have forgotten that his party, when speaking of the "ornament" rubric, have put forward in the strongest manner the argument that no rubric can be practically abrogated by any amount of

* Faulkner *v.* Litchfield, 1 Robertson, p. 251; and see the judgment of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council in Westerton *v.* Liddell, Moore's Rep., p. 176 *et seq.*

† How long this forbearance may last is another question. It is hard for any body of men to see the revival of obsolete laws tolerated only when they make in favour of the tenets of their opponents.

‡ 'Catholic Revision,' p. 22.

disuse, and that he himself had contended against the doctrine that a rubric can be obsolete.*

Lastly, and this is the real point, the observances or non-observances of Low Churchmen do not stand in close relation with an attempt to re-introduce a system from which the Church of England by a great ecclesiastical and national effort deliberately freed itself, and which it has emphatically and distinctly condemned. They do not correspond to any attempt to abolish the leading principles of the Reformation.

X. It will of course be said, that they do stand connected with ultra-Protestant opinions, and that, these are more alien from the Church than the principles of Rome itself. But is this so? It is no doubt commonly assumed by certain writers, and lies at the base of modern efforts for reunion with the Romish Church.

It is on this point that I take issue. My endeavour will be to adduce evidence from our ecclesiastical history since the Reformation to show that the Church of England stands in an entirely different attitude towards Protestant Churches from that which she holds towards the Church of Rome—nay, that her breach with even the various bodies of Trinitarian Nonconformists in this country has been looked upon as not irreparable, while that with Rome has been treated as practically hopeless.

XI. This latter point appears from the fact that two Conferences have been held by public authority for the amicable consideration of Nonconformist objections, and for the removal of them, if possible; while, whatever individual divines may have written on the subject, no step has ever been taken by such authority to indicate that reconciliation with Rome was within the compass of possibility. Nor, I venture to think, was it until a very recent period that the view now so nakedly stated, was discovered.

Certainly Sancroft is usually considered to have been a sufficiently High Churchman; yet in the Articles sent by him to the Bishops of his Province in 1688 he speaks of the two parties in terms pretty much the reverse of those adopted by a

* 'Catholic Ritual of the Church of England,' &c., by R. F. Littledale, M.A., LL.D., London, 1865, p. 19.

large class of writers in our day. He advises that the clergy exhort their people "to take heed of all seducers, and especially of Popish emissaries, who are now in great numbers gone forth amongst them, and more busy and active than ever;" and urges that "forasmuch as these Romish emissaries like the old serpent 'insidiantur calcaneo,' are wont to be most busy and troublesome to our people at the end of their lives, labouring to unsettle and perplex them in the time of sickness, and at the hour of death," the clergy should be diligent in visiting the sick, "thus with their utmost diligence watching over every sheep within their fold (especially in that critical moment), lest those evening wolves devour them."

Having bestowed these grievous names on the Priests of Rome, he proceeds to recommend to the clergy, "That they walk in wisdom towards those who are not of our Communion; and if there be in their parishes any such, that they neglect not frequently to confer with them in the spirit of meekness, seeking by all good ways and means to gain and win them over to our Communion; more especially that they have a very tender regard to our brethren, the Protestant dissenters, that upon occasion offered they visit them at their houses, and receive them kindly at their own, and treat them fairly wherever they meet them, discoursing calmly and civilly with them, persuading them (if it may be) to a full compliance with our Church, or at least, that whereto we have already attained, we may all walk by the same rule, and mind the same thing. And in order hereunto that they take all opportunities of assuring and convincing them that the Bishops of this Church are really and sincerely irreconcilable enemies to the errors, superstitions, idolatries, and tyrannies of the Church of Rome, and that the very unkind jealousies which some have had of us to the contrary, were altogether groundless."—'Card. Doc. Ann.,' vol. 2, p. 375.

It may be said that these words were written at a period of great excitement. True, but the excitement was due to a fear that the Roman Catholic religion was about to be restored, and the fact that that fear operated so strongly and widely as it did is an additional proof on my side. Had the opinions of some of our modern writers been then prevalent, the prospect would perhaps have been regarded without such extreme discomposure.

But the temper of the Church of England towards Protestantism cannot fairly be estimated by the case of those who are actual separatists from her own Communion. In relation to such there are other feelings which obviously come in and tend to complicate the question. I turn therefore to foreign Protestant communities.

I will not dwell on the attitude of our Reformers under Edward VI. and Elizabeth towards the Divines of the Continent, because it is too notorious for dispute. But it is said that this was a shortlived fancy, not to be confounded with the true spirit of the Church, and that we must look to the days of the Stuarts for our examples in this matter. Be it so; I take therefore the reign of James I., and I ask when so much was ever done for any Roman Catholic synod, as was then done for the Protestant synod of Dort, to which delegates were publicly accredited from this country? Bishop Hall is usually quoted as one of the most zealous defenders of Episcopacy. Yet Hall, as Dean of Worcester, together with Bishop Carleton, Dr. Davenant, and Dr. Ward, consented to attend the synod, and that too under instructions which expressly speak of the Protestant bodies as "Churches."* And Hall himself (when compelled to return home from ill-health) took leave of the synod with the words, "Non dignus eram ego (ut fidelissimi Romani querimoniam imitari liceat) qui et Christi et Ecclesiæ suæ nomine sanctam hanc provinciam diutius sustinerem."—Collier, vol. 9, p. 374. Edit. 1852.

In the same reign, but a little before, we find letters issued by James for contributions to be made for the city of Geneva. Archbishop Whitgift commends the cause to his clergy, "the intent and purpose being so charitable and Christian, and for relief of a city which maintains the Gospel, and for professing thereof endureth these troubles." The Duke of Savoy was then at war with the Genevese, on the score (as he alleged) of his desire to establish the Catholic religion there.†

* "Your advice shall be to those Churches, that their ministers do not deliver in the pulpit to the people those things for ordinary doctrine which are the highest points of schools," &c.

And again—"That they use no innovation in doctrine, but teach the same things which were taught twenty or thirty years past in their own churches."

Once more—"That they conform themselves to the public confessions of the neighbouring reformed churches."—*Collier's Ecclesiastical History*, vol. vii. p. 409, edit. 1852.

† See 'Card. Doc. Ann.' vol. ii. p. 67.

In 1622 Archbishop Abbott, in a letter to his suffragans, urges that preachers should hold catechetical lectures, "the which kind of preaching is more diligently observed in all the Reformed Churches of Europe than of late it hath been here in England."—'Card. Doc. Ann.,' vol. 2, p. 205.

In 1626 Charles I. writes to Archbishop Abbott to excite the people to contribute for the support of the King of Denmark, who had just suffered a defeat.

"If he be not presently relieved," says the King, "the cause of religion is not only likely to suffer by it in some one part, as as it hath already in a fearful manner in the Palatinate, but in all places, where it hath gotten any footing; so that if we supply not presently our allies and confederates in this case, it is likely to prove the extirpation of true religion, and the replanting of Romish superstition in all the neighbouring places of Christendom."—'Card. Doc. Ann.,' vol. 2, p. 213.

It only remains to be stated that the framer of this letter appears to have been Laud himself, then Bishop of Bath and Wells. See Dr. Cardwell's note.

It is to the reign of James I. that Field's standard work on the Church belongs, and as the author stood in high estimation, his sentiments must not be overlooked. The nature of his writings were such as to draw him into controversy with Roman Catholic theologians, and he put forth a defence of such parts of his great work as were excepted against. This will be found in the appendix to the edition published by the Ecclesiastical History Society in 1852. And it is from it that I now cite the following passage. (Vol. iv., p. 417.)

"For answer to the second part of his exception, first, I confidently affirm, and the proudest Papist under Heaven shall never prove the contrary, that Protestants have no real and essential differences in matters of faith and doctrine. Secondly, I say, that their differences in the form of government are not such as our adversaries pretend. For they that admit government by Bishops, make their authority to be fatherly, not princely; directing the rest, not excluding their advice and assistance; subordinate to provincial synods, wherein no one hath a negative voice, but the major part of the voices of the Bishops and Presbyters determineth all doubts, questions, and controversies; and they that retain not the name of Bishops,

yet have a President in each company of Presbyters, and think it a part of God's Ordinance that there should be such a one to go before the rest, and be in a sort over them; who, though they give not the name of Bishops, nor so much authority to these Presidents as antiquity did, yet is not their error in this point matchable with the errors that are amongst Papists, contradicting one another touching the Pope and his Government, in things most essentially concerning the power and authority of that supposed ministerial head of the Church."

A contemporary of Field was the learned Bishop Andrews. He touches on the subject before us in a correspondence with Du Moulin, who had expressed his apprehensions lest the high views of episcopacy prevailing in England should lead to uncharitable judgments as to the French Protestant churches. Andrews insists strongly on the happiness of our own episcopal polity, but says—

"Nec tamen si nostra [Politiæ forma] divini juris sit, inde sequitur, vel quòd sine eâ salus non sit, vel quòd stare non possit ecclesia. Cæcus sit qui non videat stantes sine eâ ecclesias: Ferreus sit qui salutem eis neget. Nos non sumus illi ferrei: latum inter ista discrimen ponimus. Potest abesse aliquid quod divini juris sit (in exteriore quidëm regimine) ut tamen substet salus: nec tu igitur *addices Tartaro, aut sententiam damnationis feres** in gregem tuam. Non est hoc damnare rem, melius illi aliquid anteponere." (Andrews' 'Opuscula quædam Posthuma.' Ang. Cath. Lib. Edition, p. 191, comp. p. 211.)

XII. Probably, however, the reply may be made that until the revision of 1662 loose views must be admitted to have prevailed; but that at that period the opinions of our theologians had become better settled. And reliance will no doubt be placed upon the preface to the Ordination Service which was then framed, as putting the matter on a more orthodox basis. It will be worth while, therefore, to look a little closely into this point.

The preface to the Ordination Service no doubt states explicitly enough that no man is to be accounted to be a lawful

* These words are borrowed from Du Moulin, as expressing what he feared would be the conclusion drawn in England as to foreign Protestants.

bishop, priest, or deacon *in the Church of England* without Episcopal consecration or ordination; and thus puts an end to the practice of ministers with presbyterian orders holding preferment, as had been the case to some extent previously. But the question remains, is this intended as a dogma to be applied to others who do not belong to our country or our communion, or is it a rule for the practice of our own Church? There seems no reason why its language should have been so carefully restricted had it been intended to be of general application. In such case the words would have naturally run, "no man shall be accounted to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon," *simpliciter*. And it is further improbable that any such sweeping effect was intended, because in the twenty-third Article, which obviously *is* intended as a general and dogmatic statement, the language is very different. We are there provided with a rule of universal application, couched in these moderate words: "Those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard."

Let it be observed that the construction against which I am contending is that the preface to the Ordination Service leads us to deny the title of Church to communities whose ministers are not episcopally ordained.*

The passage in question was, as all are aware, first introduced into the revised Prayer-book of 1662, and as soon as that revision was completed the Act of Uniformity was passed in order to sanction and enforce its use. Let us see whether the terms of that Act are such as to lead us to suppose that it so interpreted the Book which it was sanctioning and enforcing. It contains a clause which is precisely in point. Divers bodies of foreigners professing the Reformed religion had been allowed and encouraged to settle in England by preceding monarchs,† and had been permitted the free use of their own worship.

* "The Protestant bodies in Europe form no portion of the one Body," says Mr. Blenkinsopp, "because they have renounced the one Priesthood. They established a system independent of the Church, external, and even hostile to it: consequently they have cut themselves off from the participation of the one spirit as living in the Church and flowing through the sacraments, which are the veins and arteries of the one Body." —*Church and the World*, 1866, p. 187.

† It may be worth while to refer to the case of these Dutch and French Churches as set forth by themselves in a petition to Parliament in the reign

It was necessary, therefore, to protect these parties from the operation of the Act, and this might have been done with equal effect had they been described as "bodies" or "communities," or in short by any other of the periphrases by which some writers of our own day studiously avoid conferring on non-episcopal Protestants the title of Churches. Those who passed the Act of Uniformity, however, had no such scruples. They said plainly and expressly that "the penalties in this Act shall not extend to the foreigners or aliens of the *Foreign Reformed Churches* allowed, or to be allowed, by the King's Majesty, his heirs and successors in England."

But this, it will be said, is only an Act of Parliament. Very well; let us turn then to a theologian.

XIII. There are some minds to which nothing is so satisfactory in interpreting a document as to have access to the private opinions of those who framed it. Such evidence, indeed, is not very consistent with the principles of legal interpretation, nor is a craving after it to be encouraged. Of recent years, however, a remarkable instance of the tendency to set store by it has been afforded by the stress laid on the writings of Bishop Cosin, upon the ground that he took a leading part in the last

---

of Anne, when they were apprehensive that the Occasional Conformity Bill might act prejudicially to them. It is to be found in Stowe's 'London,' book v. p. 304, and states (amongst other things)—

That they were first established in the reign of King Edward VI., and afterwards in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; and have now continued in this nation upwards of 150 years.

That these Churches were, and are, composed of such persons, who themselves and their ancestors fled out of the Netherlands, France, and other parts beyond the seas, from Popish persecution.

That in the Act of Uniformity, made in the 13th and 14th years of King Charles II., there is provision made and a clause inserted in favour of the said Churches.

That King James I. of glorious memory, in 1614, sent his Royal Letters to the National Synod of the French Churches expressing his great care and concern for their peace and preservation.

That in 1618, his said Majesty sent one of his Bishops and four of the most famous Doctors of the Church of England to the Synod of Dort, who acted with the whole body, and signed all their acts.

That the Convocation of the Clergy in England were pleased to take notice of the Protestant churches abroad in several addresses made to the Crown, and to declare how much they were concerned for the preservation of their religion. That in the prayers appointed for the public fasts and upon solemn occasions, the Reformed Churches abroad are therein recommended to God.

That the Crown of England hath, on behalf of the Protestants, been guarantee in several treaties of peace between the Protestants and Papists.

That many of the English nobility and gentry, when abroad, do repair to the Protestant churches and assemblies and there receive the sacrament.

revision of the Prayer-book. His MS. notes have been carefully edited, and his sentiments cited, as if they necessarily afforded the true clue to the meaning of the alterations then made. Without admitting that they are entitled to such importance, I have no objection to give the reader the means of knowing Cosin's views on the point in hand.*

For this purpose I shall give an extract from a letter written by him to a Mr. Cordel at Blois, who, it seems, had scruples as to whether he ought to communicate with the French Protestants, which he had been invited to do.

Cosin writes,—

"I like your moderation well, in giving so fair and calm an answer to M. Testard's motion for communicating in their Church; which truly (to speak my mind freely to you) I would not wish any of ours absolutely to refuse, or determine to be unlawful, for fear of a greater scandal that may thereupon arise, than we can tell how to answer or excuse; especially if any of us should renounce it upon those two grounds which you allege for them,

"1. That they have no priests.

"2. That they have no consecration of the elements.

"1. For as to the first, though we may safely say and maintain it, that their ministers are not so duly and rightly ordained, as they should be by those prelates and bishops of the Church who, since the apostles' time, have only had the ordinary power and authority to make and constitute a priest,* yet that by reason of this defect there is a *total nullity* in their ordination, or that they be therefore no priests or ministers of the Church at all, because they are ordained by those only who are no more but priests or ministers among them; for my part I would be loath to affirm and determine against them."

He then proceeds to distinguish between what is *disorderly* and what is *unlawful*, and amongst other things says,

"If at any time a minister so ordained in these French Churches came to incorporate himself in ours, and to receive a public charge or cure of souls among us in the Church of

* The reader will notice how similar these words are to those in the Preface to the Ordination Service.

England (as I have known some of them to have so done of late, and can instance in many other before my time) our Bishops did not re-ordain him before they admitted to his charge, as they would have done, if his former ordination here in France had been void. Nor did our laws require more of him than to declare his public consent to the religion received among us, and to subscribe the articles established."

And he argues,

"If upon this ground we renounce the French, we must for the very same reason renounce all the ministers of Germany besides (for the superintendents that make and ordain ministers there have no new ordination beyond their own presbytery at all); and then what will become of the Protestant party?"

It will be observed that the interests of Protestantism weighed greatly with Cosin. He had not learned to consider them as opposed to those of the Catholic Church.

He continues,

"If the Church and kingdom of England have acknowledged them (as they did in admitting of them, when they fled thither for refuge, and placing them by public authority in divers of the most eminent cities among us, without prohibiting to any of our people to go and communicate with them) why should we, that are but private persons, utterly disclaim their communion in their own country?"

Hence he concludes,

"And therefore under that protestation, which M. Testard offers you permission to make, and considering there is no prohibition of our Church against it (as there is against our communicating with the Papists, and *that* well grounded upon the scripture and will of God), I do not see but that both you and others that are with you may (either in case of necessity, when you cannot have the sacrament among yourselves, or in regard of declaring your unity in professing the same religion, which you and they do) go otherwhiles to communicate reverently with them of the French Church."*

However, he adds, that he could wish that the words which the French Church used might be pronounced to the individual

* These words, coupled with the prohibition to communicate with the Papists, are in themselves sufficient to shew the bent of the writer's mind, and its complete opposition to such views as have recently been put forward among us.

communicant when he received, and that he might be allowed to receive kneeling. See Cosin's works, Ang. Cath. Lib. Edit., vol. iv., p. 401. This letter was written in 1650. In a subsequent letter of March 21, 1657, he refers to it thus (some exception having apparently been taken to it):

"If a perfect copy of my writing (which is long) be among you, I fear not the censure of any moderate and learned man whatsoever; and if the Presbyterians think to get any advantage by it, they will much deceive themselves. It was written against the rash assertion of some forward persons here [he was then at Paris] that said absolutely there was neither any minister nor any sacrament, nor any Church, in France amongst the French reformed, of which mind neither myself nor any other honest man must ever be." Vol. iv., p. 421.

Both these letters, however, were written before the last revision of the Prayer-book, though the latter (a deliberate adherence to the former) comes within a very few years of it. Did Cosin then change his opinion, and is the Preface to the Ordination Service a record of his altered views?

No doubt he took part in framing a new regulation that in our own Communion no one should for the future minister without Episcopal ordination; but the question is, was his *animus* in so doing to lay down the proposition that other Christian bodies whose ministers were not so ordained had no lawful ministers, and were not Churches at all; or did he mean to act within the limits so wisely set by the Preface "Concerning Ceremonies" at the beginning of the Prayer-book, "In these our doings we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe anything but to our own people only?"

Happily there is evidence to shew that he retained his friendly feelings towards Protestants abroad, and had no intention of unchurching them. His will bears date 1672, at least ten years after he had acted as a commissioner in the revision. In it occurs a remarkable passage, which, as well from its date as from the document in which it occurs, may well be taken as the expression of his final opinion, recorded at a calm and solemn moment. It is as follows:

"In what part of the world soever any Churches are extant, bearing the name of Christ, and professing the true Catholic faith and religion, worshipping and calling upon God the

Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, with one heart and voice, if anywhere I be now hindered actually to be joined with them, either by distance of countries or variance amongst men, or by any other test whatsoever, yet always in my mind and affection I unite and join with them; which I desire to be chiefly understood of Protestants and the best Reformed (bene reformatis) Churches." Vol. v., 527.

XIV. There is only one more point on which it is needful to touch. A good deal is sometimes made of Archbishop Wake's correspondence with M. Beauvois at the beginning of the last century, as to a reunion of the Church of England and the Church of Rome, as if the Archbishop thought that it was in that direction that union was to be looked for rather than with Protestant communities.

The truth is that Wake was of a Catholic spirit desirous for peace and unity generally, and it was under the influence of such desires that he sought it even where least practicable. But to suppose that he preferred the Church of Rome to the foreign Protestants would be a mistake into which no one could fall who did not take his information at second hand. One passage will suffice to shew his sentiments towards the latter. He writes to M. Le Clerc as follows:

"Ecclesias reformatas, etsi in aliquibus a nostrâ Anglicanâ dissentientes, libenter amplector. Optarem equidem regimen Episcopale bene temperatum, et ab omni injustâ dominatione sejunctum, quale apud nos obtinet, et, siquid ego in his rebus sapiam, ab ipso apostolorum ævo in ecclesiâ receptum fuerit, et ab iis omnibus fuisset retentum; nec despero quin aliquando restitutum, si non ipse videam, at posteri videbunt. Interim absit ut ego tam ferrei pectoris sim, ut ob ejusmodi defectum (sic mihi absque omni invidiâ appellare liceat) aliquas earum a communione nostrâ abscindendas credam; aut cum quibusdam furiosis inter nos scriptoribus, eas nulla vera ac valida sacramenta habere, adeoque vix christianos esse pronuntiem. Unionem arctiorem inter omnes reformatos procurare quovis pretio vellem." (See Appendix to Mosheim's 'Eccles. Hist.')

It would seem that he considered the Reformed Churches to be already in those friendly relations into which he would (if possible) have endeavoured to bring even the Church of Rome.

XV. This may seem a long digression, but it has an important bearing on the point in hand. Many persons appear in every argument to start with the assumption that the Church of England lies midway between Protestantism and the Church of Rome; not a few that she lies nearer to the latter than to the former. No pains, therefore, seemed misspent in order to show that she is herself a Reformed Church, having decided sympathies with what is Protestant, and decided antipathies towards what is distinctively Romish. Wherever this is not clearly laid down, a *petitio principii* is admitted at starting, which is sure to reappear fatally at the later stages of every discussion. But, when distinctly seen, it will enable us to judge without difficulty of such questions as have been under consideration in this paper.

The fact is that during a long series of years—partly owing to the penal statutes, partly to the imputation of political disaffection under which the professors of the Romish faith were supposed to labour—Romanism was almost unheard of amongst us. Dissent was the only antagonist in presence, and dissent came to be treated as the only antagonist in existence. Hence a sort of maxim sprang up which seemed to do well enough for all practical purposes, that a man's "good Churchmanship" was to be measured by his antipathy to Puritanism. By degrees what was a rule of every-day life, became admitted as an axiom of theology. It seems really to have been supposed that the one mission of the Church of England was to denounce ultra-Protestantism. It is perfectly astonishing how far and how deeply this misconception has spread. But it cannot be examined without its fallacy being seen. "A fond thing vainly invented;" "a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God;" a thing "repugnant to the plain words of Scripture," and that "overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions;" "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits"—such is the strong language in which tenets of the Church of Rome are spoken of by the Church of England. And language like this can neither be passed over nor explained away. It gives us the measure of the vast gulf which lies between the Romish system and the doctrines of the Reformation.*

* Comp. the observations of Sir H. J. Fust in the judgment in Hodgson *v.* Oakeley, 1 Robertson, 355, et seq.

To sum up, then, the results of a long and necessarily discursive argument, it is submitted—

That if a National Church is to have any rules at all for the performance of divine service, there must be *some* occasions on which it is proper to appeal to them.

That if such occasions can ever arise, it must be when alterations are introduced of no slight magnitude in themselves, but deriving additional and peculiar importance from the fact that they are introduced on system, and with the greatest persistency—introduced by a powerful combination bent on carrying them through—and introduced with a distinct design of restoring doctrines and principles which the Church and nation long ago disowned and repudiated, and have ever since regarded with peculiar dislike and alarm.

That at such a crisis it is no sufficient objection against our appealing to such rules of the Church as bear upon the question; that certain other departures from the letter of her regulations exist in other quarters, inasmuch as such departures are not novel, nor systematic, and do not tend in that direction to which the Church of England has always looked with the greatest apprehension.

It must be distinctly understood that it is not intended in this place to offer any opinion as to either of the disputed questions—

Whether *any* departure from the Rubric can in principle be defensible—

Whether *every* departure ought to be, and can be, restrained in practice by authority without a minute and vexatious uniformity.

It is simply intended to protest against the supposition that there is any—the least—obligation to enter on these collateral and vexed questions, when we are concerned with the great issue of the maintenance of our public worship against those who would "obliterate all traces of the Reformation."

"Anglicans," says a writer in 'The Church and the World,' 1866, p. 212, "are reproached by Protestants with their resemblance to Romans. They say a stranger entering into a church where Ritual is carefully attended to, might easily mistake it for a Roman service. Of course he might: the whole purpose of the great revival has been to eliminate the dreary Protestantism of

the Hanoverian period, and restore the glory of Catholic worship. Our churches are restored after the mediæval pattern, and our Ritual must accord with the Catholic standard." *

It comes, then, to this:—When a clergyman glories in so conducting the worship of his church as to render it indistinguishable from that of Rome, is it impossible to put a stop to such a state of things because his neighbour in the next parish does not read the prayer for the Church Militant every Sunday?

Are we bound to treat it as an open question whether the English Reformation was or was not "an unmitigated disaster," † until we are prepared to say whether a minister ought to be prosecuted if, in the administration of the Sacrament, he says the words to more than one communicant at a time?

It has been a favourite image with many minds to conceive of the Church of England as of a body kept at rest by the mutual counteraction of the polar forces of High and Low Church. Indeed it seems to have been often regarded as the highest effort of Episcopal statesmanship to play off these forces against each other, and thus to maintain an equipoise. There is, therefore, some danger lest Ritualism should be regarded as merely a harmless intensification of one of these forces, and treated accordingly. I venture to submit that it is something of a wholly distinct and far less innocent kind; that it is a force differing essentially in its direction and character; a disturbing force, which, so long as the position of the Church is determined by the conditions laid down at the Reformation, no system of ecclesiastical dynamics will ever prevent from being subversive of equilibrium. I speak, of course, of Ritualism as a system. It would be most unfair to set down all as Ritualists upon whom popular misapprehension or their own want of caution has fixed the name.‡ And even among those who glory in the title of Ritualists we ought unreservedly to recognise the zeal and

* It is true that the author proceeds to justify this by a reference to the Prayer-book itself; but when he tells us that "the Altar and its ornaments are nearly the same [as in 'the Western rite,' *i.e.* the Liturgy of Rome]; the habits and vestments of the Priesthood are the same, the actions are the same,"—the reader will form his own conclusions as to the system by which the Prayer-book is interpreted.

† 'Church Times,' March 14, 1868.

‡ At the same time I certainly think the day has arrived when all who really stand well-affected to the principles of the Reformation owe it to themselves and to the Church to put their sentiments beyond the possibility of doubt or mistake.

devotion which are so often to be seen. But then these qualities are to be found in the Church of Rome itself, and their presence, therefore, is in nowise incompatible with the holding of Roman doctrine on the part of those who exhibit them. The point at issue is not the virtues of individuals, but the tendencies of systems. Private deeds of piety and charity may be most fully acknowledged, but they do not affect the great question before us, which is nothing less than whether the future of the Church of England is to be shaped by the spirit of the Reformation, or by the genius of Rome.

BENJAMIN SHAW.

ESSAY II.

THE INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

By LORD ARTHUR HERVEY, M.A.,

Archdeacon of Sudbury and Rector of Ickworth with Horringer.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY II.

Fundamental principle of Episcopal government stated. Various modifications of the application of this principle by the Church Catholic to the varying wants of different Churches. Differences of Episcopal rank and power in different sees.

Chorepiscopi in the fourth century; their rank and functions. Coadjutor Bishops. Joint Bishops. Suffragan Bishops of Henry VIII. Periodeutæ.

Archdeacons. Origin of the Archdeacon's office. Became universally Presbyters before the twelfth century. Division of sees into Archdeaconries, and growth of the Archdeacons' power after the Norman Conquest. Archdeacons nearly the same as the Chorepiscopi. Defect in their power to help the Bishops supplemented by the titular or suffragan Bishops.

The Church at the present day not tied down in respect of the size of her dioceses or her mode of assisting her Bishops.

Work required of English Bishops at the present day. Oversight of Clergy and Laity. Confirmations. Discipline. Synodical action. Social and political functions. Theological learning.

Fundamental objections to any large increase of the number of Bishops. Fundamental reasons for lightening the Bishops' labours. Objectionable modes of doing so.

The remedy proposed: make the Archdeacons Chorepiscopi. Advantages of this scheme. Offices that would be performed by such Episcopal Archdeacons. Facility of Endowment. Conclusion.

THE INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND*

THE government of a body like the Church, whose condition, in the different countries where it is planted, is liable to vary from that of small and numerically insignificant companies, to that of associations co-extensive with the State in which they exist, is obviously a problem which might prove difficult of solution. The system which might be the best for a little body of a score or two of men and women in a humble station of life at Jerusalem or Corinth, might be very inadequate to the wants of a spiritual polity embracing the whole bounds of the Roman Empire, and comprising emperors, patricians, and senators, as well as ordinary citizens, within its sphere. To provide for the maintenance of doctrine and discipline in a voluntary association of believers in Christ coming together only for worship and mutual edification, is one thing; to regulate the polity of those believers when the wealth and power of an empire has passed into their hands, is another. Again, the difficulty of the problem is greatly increased by the consideration that the whole community whose government has to be organised is scattered over and permeates different countries and different ages of the world, as remote from one another in their social and political organisation as they are in their geographical position, or in the time and period of their existence.

This Church polity must fit the wants of Jews dwelling under Roman bondage in the first century after Christ, and those of Teutons breathing all the freedom of the West. It must suit the condition of those ruled over by Byzantine despotism in the middle ages, and that of the republican communities of the United States of America in the nineteenth century. It must be adapted to the civilisation of Rome, Athens, or Paris, as well as to the barbarism of Tartary, New Zealand, or Zoolu.

Or, to put it in a different form, the chief officers of the Church

may in one instance have merely to regulate the distribution of the alms subscribed out of their deep poverty by a handful of poor artisans; in another they may have to sit in council to legislate for all Churches and for all time, or take their place, as in our own land, in the highest court of the foremost nation of the earth, and make their influence felt in every transaction of the State. And yet, through all these great diversities of situation and function, the common and essential duty attaches to them all alike of maintaining the doctrine and discipline, given by our Lord Jesus Christ to His Church, inviolate and undefiled.

Now from a consideration of these conditions of the Church, it might be concluded that any government to be provided for it by the infinite wisdom of its Founder, would combine with a certain fixity of essential principle, a considerable elasticity in the application of the principle to the details of practice. For the preservation of doctrine and discipline, and for the maintenance of union and communion, in so widely diffused a body, a firm and unwavering rule was of absolute necessity. While for the adaptation of the rule to the wants of such varying communities great flexibility was no less necessary, if the rule was to be manageable in practice. Accordingly, when we examine the constitution given by Christ to His Church, and the working out of that constitution in the Church Catholic in the earlier ages of Christianity, we find exactly such an union of fixity and flexibility.

I. The fundamental principle of Church government apparent in the institution of Christ, is the joint Episcopate of the whole Church * in the hands of Apostles chosen and nominated by Himself. "As my Father hath sent me, so send I you." "In the regeneration. . . . ye shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." And the earliest glimpse which we obtain from Scripture of this constitution in action shows us the Holy College of the Twelve Apostles ruling over the Church with united authority, regulating its discipline, pro-

* This principle is often asserted by the Fathers with reference to the whole College of Bishops throughout the world—"Episcopatus unus est cujus à singulis in solidum pars tenetur."—*Cypr. de Unitate Eccles.*, 522; *Bingham*, book ii. ch. v.

viding for its increase, and legislating for its doctrinal purity. (Acts ii. 14, 42; iv. 33; vi. 2, 6; viii. 1, 14; xv. 2, &c.)

II. But the evidence from Holy Scripture also shows that, by the side of this official equality of the Apostles, there grew up an inequality arising both from personal qualities, and from peculiarities of position. Peter and John stand out as of superior weight among their brethren, from their character and pre-eminent spiritual endowments, and James from his official position as Head of the Church at Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 9; Acts xv. 13); while somewhat later the new Apostle of the Gentiles outshines all his brother Apostles in the abundance of his gifts, and in the extent of the diocese committed to him.*

III. And this leads us to notice another modification of the application of the principle of the Apostolic Episcopate. At first it was a joint episcopate of the whole Church exercised by the United College residing at Jerusalem, the mother Church of Christendom. But about the time of the call of St. Paul to the apostleship, a new arrangement was introduced. The Gentile Churches were committed to Paul and Barnabas, those of the circumcision to James, Peter, and John, and the rest of the Apostles. And this element of division of labour and responsibility was soon extended further as the wants of the growing congregations of Christians required it. To James, as we gather from Scripture, and learn positively from Church history, had been given the oversight of the Church of Jerusalem. St. Paul committed to Timothy the Church of Ephesus, and to Titus that of Crete, while later still we find the Churches of Asia under the special charge of St. John. And then as time advances we see a somewhat different element of inequality arise among the Bishops of the Church, as they now began to be exclusively called, I mean the relative importance of the cities of which they were Bishops. A Bishop of Jerusalem, a Bishop of Antioch, a Bishop of Alexandria, a Bishop of Rome, was necessarily a more important and a more influential person than the Bishop of some petty town or village in Africa or Syria or Italy of which the name was scarcely known. And, in the nature of

* "St. Paul had the whole world committed to his care, and every city under the sun," &c. – *Chrysos.*, Hom. 17; see *Bingham*, book ii. ch. v. sec. i.

things, greater authority, wider privileges, higher dignity, and fuller jurisdiction, attached themselves to these greater sees than to the lesser ones. Hence, as Christianity spread wider and took deeper root in the Roman Empire, these differences of rank and authority expressed themselves in the different titles of Bishops, Archbishops, Metropolitans, Primates, Patriarchs, Exarchs, and Popes,* this last title being eventually limited to the Bishop of Rome. It is a striking exemplification of the course pursued by the Church Catholic in all ages,—that, namely, of modifying the details of episcopal government according to the varying wants of the Church,—that after the establishment of Christianity in the Roman Empire by Constantine and his successors, the dignities and privileges of the different sees followed exactly the civil privileges of the different cities. Thus the bishop of a city which was the capital of a province was called the Metropolitan or Primate, and had certain rights of jurisdiction over Bishops of other cities in the same province. The Bishop of a city which was the capital of a civil diocese† comprising several provinces, was called an Exarch, or Patriarch, and had certain rights of jurisdiction over the metropolitans, as for example, the Churches of Antioch, Ephesus, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Rome. But this prevailed chiefly in the East, nor was the rank of patriarchs strictly confined to such Bishops of dioceses, as for example, the Bishop of Jerusalem was called a Patriarch in the Novells of Justinian. On the other hand, just as the dioceses were subject to the four prefects among whom Constantine divided the whole Roman world, so among the Patriarchs there arose four of superior dignity to the rest, viz.: Rome, the ancient capital of the world; Antioch, the capital of the East; Alexandria, the capital of Egypt; and Constantinople, the new capital of the world, to which the second place was assigned.‡

Another principle which regulated, or at least influenced to a certain extent, the dignity and privileges of the different Bishops, was the fact of their being Apostolic Churches, *i.e.*, founded by

---

* *Pope* was the proper title of the Bishop of Alexandria, as *e.g.* in St. Mark's Liturgy.

† There were in all in Constantine's time thirteen dioceses: five under the Prefect of the East, three under the Prefect of Illyrium, two under the Prefect of Italy, and three under the Prefect of the Gauls.—*See Notit. Dignit.*

‡ The above details are chiefly taken from Dupin's 'Dissertationes de antiquâ Ecclesiæ Disciplinâ.'

Apostles. A Bishop of Rome or Antioch derived some additional authority from being the successor of St. Peter; Tertullian appeals to the Bishops of Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, and others as the successors of St. Paul, and the Patriarch of Jerusalem derived all his dignity from Jerusalem having been the Mother Church of Christendom, and the see of the Apostle St. James. Obviously, too, and in the nature of things, Churches which sent out missions and founded other Churches which they supplied with bishops and clergy would be likely to retain some jurisdiction over the Churches which they founded. Hence, for example, the natural subjection of the Churches founded in England by Augustine to the Roman obedience, and the subjection of the Churches in English colonies to the Archbishop of Canterbury. In Africa the precedence and prerogatives of the different Bishops were regulated by a different principle, that of priority of consecration. The Bishop of Carthage indeed was Primate or Patriarch of all Africa in right of his see, but the primacy or metropolitical privileges of the Bishops of the provinces under him was regulated by seniority of consecration, which gave rise to the decree of the Council of Milevum A.D. 402, that every bishop at his consecration should receive from the Bishops who consecrated him a written paper stating the year and the day on which he was consecrated.

But yet another variety in the exercise of episcopal functions may be found in the Chorepiscopi. There is a difference of opinion among learned men as to the etymology and proper meaning of the term: some explaining it to mean country Bishops (*τῆς χώρας ἐπίσκοποι*), in contradistinction to the city Bishops; others vice-bishops (*ἐν χώρᾳ ἐπισκόπου*).* And it is in favour of this last interpretation that the Latin term for chorepiscopus is Vicarius Episcopi, the bishop's deputy. Thus the Latin version of the canons of the Council of Ancyra, by Isidore Mercator (8th century), has *Vicariis Episcoporum, quos Græci* chorepiscopos *vocant*, &c. (Routh, 'Rel. Sac.' iii. 431). And in England, in the year 1322, Stephen, Bishop of London, had under him a *chorepiscopus*, who assisted both the Bishop of London and other Bishops of the province of Canterbury in ordinations, consecrations of churches, and other episcopal func-

* Stephan. 'Thesaur.'

tions. So, too, among the ancient MSS. in the Palace of Lambeth is one headed *Indiculus chorepiscoporum seu suffraganeorum Episcoporum Diœcesis Cantuariensis* (*ib.* p. 439). The chorepiscopi in the dioceses of Cæsarea are described in the title to Basil's Epistles as "the bishops under him" (τοὺς ὑφ' ἑαυτον ἐπισκόπους). And in Basil's own letters their position is clearly marked by the contrast between "the chorepiscopi," of whom there were several, and "the Bishop," who was one, and to whom they were to give the necessary information concerning the candidates for Holy Orders. (Epist. liv. alias clxxxi.) On the other hand, it is true that the chorepiscopi had under their charge country villages (called κώμαι, and συμμορίαι, and χώρια), and that the Presbyters of such country villages were called ἐπιχώριοι πρεσβυτέροι; so that the explanation of the word, as meaning Bishops of country districts, in opposition to the city Bishops —which is that commonly accepted—is at least plausible.

However, it is more to the purpose to note that, whatever is the true etymology of the term, there is no doubt that at the opening of the fourth century there did exist, widely spread in different dioceses—chiefly, perhaps, in the East—an order of Bishops, inferior in dignity, in jurisdiction, and in power to the Bishops simply so called, but exercising strictly episcopal functions under the supreme direction of the Bishop of the diocese. They had distinctly power, as a matter of spiritual function, to ordain Priests and Deacons, and to confirm neophytes, and to give letters of peace, and to attend councils; though, as a matter of order and discipline, they were restricted in the exercise of these functions and obliged to act in subordination to the Bishop. It was to secure their subordination to the Bishop of the diocese, and to check the evils of different kinds which might arise from their position if independent, that the Council of Ancyra and others passed the canons relating to them,* the neglect of which was so much complained of by Basil.† But those same canons

* Canon xiii. "It is not lawful for Chorepiscopi to ordain Priests or Deacons without the permission of the Bishop in writing."

† "I am much grieved that the ancient canons are broken, and all discipline is banished from the Church, and I fear lest the affairs of the Church fall into utter confusion. Anciently when any were to be admitted to Holy Orders the Presbyters and Deacons of the place inquired diligently into their whole life, and reported to the Chorepiscopi, and these informed the Bishop. But now the Chorepiscopi take it all into their own hands. . . . . Let the ancient canons be restored, and none be admitted to Holy Orders without my consent."—*Epist.* liv.; see also *Epist.* liii.

bear the most unequivocal testimony to the true Episcopal order of the chorepiscopi, likening them to the seventy (who were appointed by Christ Himself and supplemental to the Apostles), calling them the colleagues of the Bishops in their sacerdotal functions (συλλειτουργοὶ), and separating them in the most marked way from the country Presbyters. (Conc. of Neocæs. Can. xiii.) Basil himself, too, gives the most decisive testimony to their true episcopal order, calling them προεστῶτας τῆς συμμορίας (Ep. 290); while he at the same time insists peremptorily upon their subordination to himself, and by his reference to the ancient canons shows how completely this chorepiscopacy was a part of the discipline of the Catholic Church.

With regard to one other special function of the Chorepiscopi, their zealous care for the poor in the country, which the 13th canon of the Council of Neocæsarea mentions as a special ground of the honour and respect which ought to be paid them, it may be well to notice a remarkable illustration given by Basil in one or two of his epistles. Thus it appears from one epistle (Epist. cxlii.) that Basil had summoned his chorepiscopi to meet the Numerarius, or auditor of accounts of the Governor of the province (Præses), in order to obtain from him an exemption from taxation or rates for the poor-houses of the several villages under the chorepiscopi. In Epist. cxliii. Basil, excusing himself on the score of ill-health, says he has sent a brother, a Chorepiscopus, and entreats the Numerarius to visit the poor-house under the Chorepiscopus' charge, and supply him with what he wants for the poor. These passages show that the charge of the poor of their villages was especially entrusted to the Chorepiscopi, who, in this as other respects, were the colleagues of the Bishops.

Another variation in the tenure of the Episcopate was when from old age and infirmity a bishop received a coadjutor, who was to succeed him in his bishopric at his death, as in the case of Alexander, who was appointed coadjutor to Narcissus, Bishop of Jerusalem, in the second century (Euseb. 'Eccles. Hist.' vi. xi.); or when to avoid schism, or to open a way for the return of schismatical Bishops to the unity of the Church, partner Bishops presided jointly over the same see, for examples of which see Bingham, Book II., chap. xiii., though it was contrary

to the 8th Canon of the Council of Nice. The Suffragan Bishops, as they were improperly called in the Act of Henry VIII. (26 Henr. Oct.), combined something of the nature of coadjutor bishops with that of the ancient chorepiscopi; they lasted down to the reign of Elizabeth, who appointed three—Barnes, Stern, and Rogers—who were respectively suffragans of Nottingham, Colchester, and Bedford. The other towns which had suffragans were Ipswich, Thetford, Dover, Penrith, Shrewsbury, and Bristol.*

But besides these methods of increasing the efficacy of episcopal government and discipline, the Church in different ages has resorted to other expedients for the same end. When towards the close of the fourth century chorepiscopi were getting out of repute—partly owing to their exactions in receiving presents from those whom they admitted to minor orders, partly from their insubordination to the city Bishops, and partly, perhaps, from the growing pride and pomp of the city Bishops, which indisposed them to admit any partners in their dignity—the Council of Laodicea instituted an order of itinerant Presbyters, called *περιοδευταὶ*, to take their place, whose duty it was to visit the country parishes and report to the Bishop. In England, especially, the same end was sought to be attained by the institution of Archdeacons.

The office of Archdeacon was a very ancient one in the Church. Following the precedent of Acts vi. 5,† there were in the Church of Rome in primitive times, and down to the end of the fifth century at least,‡ and in many other Churches, always seven Deacons—neither more nor less, and the chief of these was called the *Archdeacon*. From the fact that the Archdeacon was in constant and close attendance upon the Bishop ("a Pontificis latere non recedit," *Jerom. Comm. on Ezek.*, c. 48), and was keeper of the Church's chest and the chief dispenser, under the Bishop, of the Church's treasure,§ he came to be the next person in

* Routh, 'Reliq. Sac.' iii. p. 439. Archdeacon Hale gives the list of places appropriated by the Act for giving titles to suffragan bishops. They are 25, viz. besides those mentioned above, Guildford, Southampton, Taunton, Shaftesbury, Molton, Marlborough, Leicester, Gloucester, Bridgewater, Grantham, Hull, Huntingdon, Cambridge, Berwick, St. German's, and Isle of Wight.

† *Διάκονοι ἑπτὰ ὀφείλουσιν εἶναι κατὰ τὸν κανόνα, κἂν πάνυ μεγάλη εἴη ἡ πόλις· πεισθήσῃ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς βίβλου τῶν πράξεων.* — *Can.* xiv. *Concil. Neocæs.* *Διακόνους ἑπτά.* — *Cornel.* as quoted below.

‡ *See* Routh's note on the fragment of Cornelius.—*Rel. Sac.* iii. p. 43.

§ *See* the account of the martyrdom

importance to the Bishop, as in the case of St. Lawrence, and was usually looked upon as the Bishop's successor in the see, as in the case of Athanasius, Archdeacon of Alexandria; Cæcilian, Archdeacon of Carthage; and many others. In the seventh century, as we learn from Isidore Hispalensis (Bingham, i. p. 243), "the parochial clergy were under the archdeacon's care; it belonged to him to order matters and end controversies among them; to give the Bishop an account what churches stood in need of repairing; to make inquiry, by the Bishop's order, into the state of every parish, and see what condition the ornaments and goods of the church were in." But as the discharge of such functions gave the Archdeacon a kind of jurisdiction over Presbyters, it seems to have been thought incongruous that one of the inferior order of deacons should exercise such powers. Accordingly, from about the ninth century the Archdeacons began to be of the order of Presbyters, and by the twelfth century they were so universally.

In England we do not hear much about them in the Saxon times, but soon after the Conquest * that division of dioceses into archdeaconries took place, which has existed ever since, and Archdeacons began to occupy an important place under the Bishops in the government of the Church. It is thought that owing to the attendance of the Bishops upon the King as Barons, in his great Councils, as recognised by the Constitutions of Clarendon, and other secular duties which devolved upon them, they were obliged to grant larger delegations of power for the administration of their dioceses than till that time they had been accustomed to do. Hence the jurisdiction of the Archdeacons was enlarged. Instead of the annual Visitations of the Bishop required by the Canon law, and by the law of the English Church,† the Bishops came to visit only every third or fourth year, or every seventh in some dioceses, the Archdeacons holding Visitations in the intervening years. The Archdeacons originally, as the vicars of the Bishop,‡ but by degrees with an independent authority, held their own Courts, and passed their own judgments, and appointed their own officials. The labours

of St. Lawrence, Archdeacon of Rome, in Ceillier, iii. 286.

* *See* A. J. Stephens 'On the Book of Common Prayer,' vol. i. p. 24 *sqq.*

† "Unusquisque Episcopus Parochiam suam omni anno semel circumeat." —*Council of Cloveshoe*, A.D. 787.

‡ "Vicarius Episcopi."—*Lyndwood.*

of the Bishops were thus greatly lightened, there being nothing which the Archdeacons, Chancellors, Commissaries, and Vicars could not perform, except the strictly episcopal functions of ordination and confirmation.* So that the Archdeacons, in the time between the Conquest and the Reformation, filled very nearly the same place as the Chorepiscopi of the third and fourth centuries did, except that, not being Bishops, they could not perform strictly episcopal functions. Such, however, were not required of them. By their Visitations, by the proceedings in their Courts for the maintenance of doctrine and discipline, by their inspection of churches, and other functions, they sufficiently eased the Bishop's hands and supplemented what the wants of the Church required. What, however, was still wanting in the way of aid was made up by the appointment already referred to, of Titular or Suffragan Bishops. "For about two hundred years before the Reformation there was a perfect succession of such Bishops in almost all the dioceses of England; and the registers of this diocese (of London), especially those of the Bishops Fitz-James and Tonstall, afford abundant proof of the labours of these suffragans, the general ordinations in every Ember-week being celebrated chiefly by Titular Bishops."† Archdeacon Hale also shows very conclusively that Henry VIII.'s Act for appointing Suffragans, which is still the law of the land, was merely an Act for regulating the existing practice under the new circumstances of the repudiation of the Papal power. The Act of the 25th Henry VIII. had provided for the nomination of Bishops by the Crown, and their election by the Chapters, without any reference to the Pope; and the Act of the 26th Henry VIII. goes on to make provision "for suffragans, which have been accustomed to be had within this realm for the more speedy administration of Sacraments . . . . and for the commodity of good and devout people." The Act also provided for the titles of these Suffragans being taken from English towns,‡ in-

* Persons not being Bishops might consecrate churches, &c., by commission from the Bishop.

† Archdeacon Hale 'On the Extension of the Ministry,' p. 89.

‡ The whole number of places appropriated for giving titles to Suffragan Bishops was twenty-six, viz. Thetford, Ipswich, Colchester, Dover, Guildford, Southampton, Taunton, Shaftesbury, Molton, Marlborough, Bedford, Leicester, Gloucester, Shrewsbury, Bristol, Penrith, Bridgewater, Nottingham, Grantham, Hull, Huntingdon, Cambridge, Berwick, St. German's, and one other. (Penrith is reckoned twice in the list of twenty-six.)—*Extension of the Minist.*, p. 95.

stead of as before from obsolete dioceses in Europe, Asia, or Africa, *in partibus infidelium*, as it was commonly said, which had been the universal practice in the Western Church for some ages. This custom, which is senseless enough, had probably arisen from the primitive practice of allowing Bishops who had been ejected from their dioceses, or not allowed to take possession of them by factions in the Church to which they were nominated, and who were called σχολάζοντες ἐπίσκοποι (vacant Bishops) to act as Chorepiscopi to any other Bishop that would entertain them. (Bingham, i. p. 138.) But the giving of a merely fictitious title seems to be neither rational nor truthful.

Having now seen the principles of episcopal government acknowledged in the Church from the earliest times, and the various methods adopted in different countries and in different ages for supplying any deficiencies in episcopal supervision which might arise, we seem to be in a position to enter boldly upon the consideration of the present wants of the Church in England, and the best method of supplying them.

And first, we may dismiss at once all pretended necessity, arising from the precedents of the Church Catholic, for having dioceses of one size rather than another. Nothing can be more various than the practice of the Church in this respect. To look only at our country, in the seventh century, the dioceses were co-extensive with the kingdoms, and at first there was but one Bishop of the East Angles. Only in Kent were there two bishoprics—Canterbury and Rochester—and it was not till later that East Anglia was divided into the two sees of Dunwich and Elmham. (Bentham's 'Hist. of Ely.')

Then, again, the practice of naming the Bishop from the cathedral town, though general, was not universal. He was not unfrequently named Bishop of the people, as *e. g.* the Bishop of the East Angles, the Bishop of the Mæso-goths, &c. All such details are, so to speak, accidental and variable, and the Church has full power to deal with them as she judges best. In like manner, as regards the number of assistant Bishops or Chorepiscopi which a Bishop may have under him, it must depend upon the exigencies of the Church. In small dioceses a Bishop may have one, two, or three Chorepiscopi; but Basil had about fifty in the diocese of Cæsarea. This too, then, is a matter in which the Church is not tied down by precedents, but must

exercise the unfettered liberty of action which the Lord has given her for edification.

What, then, is most expedient for the Church of England in these days?

If we take a comprehensive view of the work to be done by the Bishops of the Church of England at the present day, we shall, I think, see that it may be comprised under the following heads:—

I. Proper episcopal work. The spiritual oversight of the congregations of Christ's flock committed to them. The Bishops must see that, either by themselves or the Priests under them, the congregations are duly fed with the Bread of Life, have the Sacraments duly and sufficiently ministered to them, and the Offices of the Church rightly and orderly performed among them. They must exercise a watchful oversight over the Clergy, with all fatherly admonition and brotherly love; keep tight the reins of godly discipline; and maintain an evenhanded balance of justice and impartiality. They should exert, too, a personal influence—the influence of superior wisdom, holiness, courage, and zeal—over the whole Clergy of the diocese; and, as far as may be, over the laity likewise, by means of personal knowledge and intercourse. The Bishop should be the mainspring and the guiding influence of all the spiritual work done in his diocese, restraining the indiscretion of the young and ardent, stimulating the energies of the slothful and indifferent, correcting the errors of the ill-judging and ill-informed, and throwing the weight of his own authority and influence into all wise schemes and useful undertakings. Especially, and as the work which pre-eminently belongs to him, he must take due order for supplying the ranks of the Church with "fit persons to serve in the sacred ministry." All measures tending to train young men to be "good ministers of Jesus Christ," to supply sound theological learning, and Christian habits of thought and action, and to diffuse a zealous, self-denying, laborious, loving spirit among them, will engage his anxious attention; and he will consider himself as successful in his episcopate just in proportion as he sees the parishes in his diocese served by men who are "examples of the believers in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity."

Then there are the confirmations. And that the confirma-

tions of the young should be held frequently, at short intervals of time and space, should be conducted reverently, impressively, unhurriedly; that the best means should be taken for connecting them closely with the first communion of those confirmed, and for making them tell upon the edification of the whole parish, are things of as great moment with reference to the general well-being of the whole Church as any that could be named.

Another branch of what is properly episcopal work (though it is often delegated, and in the Church of England especially has been delegated to Archdeacons and other vicars of the Bishop) must be mentioned, and that is discipline. If ever we are to have any revival of godly discipline in the Church of England, by which our Church services shall be restored to their true use and significance, and rescued from profanation and misapplication, and our Church itself cleansed and purified from the defilement of an indiscriminate communion, it must be by the increased tension of episcopal supervision. The Bishop is the lawful holder of the keys, and the doors must not be negligently *left* open, in order to save the trouble of opening and shutting them. More reality of discipline in the Anglican Church through the reform of the Bishop's Courts, or in some other way, is among those important changes which must be comprehended under any scheme for the increase of the episcopate.

One other branch of episcopal work, which is likely to draw largely upon the energies of our Bishops in the times on which we are entering, must not be overlooked, and that is the presiding over synods. It seems probable that synodical action, and consultations of Clergy and Laity, under the presidency of the Bishop, on Church matters, will play a prominent part in the ensuing history of the Anglican Church; and therefore any survey of the work of our Bishops, taken for the purpose of estimating the probable requirements on their time and intellectual power, must not omit the consideration of the important function of presiding over large synods, one which requires a great amount of moral weight and intellectual power to make it beneficial.

II. But besides such proper episcopal work, the Bishops of the Church of England have most important duties to perform in the State, and in the social community. As members of the

House of Lords, it is essential that they should have due weight in the Parliament of the country. They must be men of that ability and that discretion which shall enable them to command the respectful attention of statesmen, and of the country at large, and to direct and control such legislation as bears directly upon the interests of the Church; and for this end they must have a considerable amount of leisure at their disposal. Then again, the Bishop has to exercise an influence upon society, to originate and recommend a variety of charitable schemes, to interpose by warning and by counsel when things objectionable are being done or threatened, to take the lead in many movements of various kinds, and generally to leaven the society around him with the leaven of Christian sobriety and truth; and all this, in a wealthy and highly civilised country like England, can only be done by men who combine high character and great abilities with a considerable amount of social dignity.

One other point must not be omitted from this survey of the requirements of English Bishops, and that is theological learning. If our judges are required to be good lawyers, our Bishops must be good theologians; and they must combine with extensive theological learning a sound practical judgment. They must combine a sufficient knowledge of the doctrines, laws, canons, opinions, writings, and practices of past ages with an enlightened acquaintance with the wants and modes of thought and moral and intellectual peculiarities of the men of their own age. If the presbytery or laity of the Church are better theologians and more learned men than the Bishops, it will not be in nature for them to bow to the decisions, or to follow the lead, of those whom they must look upon as in this respect their inferiors. The Bishops can only maintain that authority which it is so desirable they should maintain over an active and sometimes restless Clergy, by maintaining a superiority of professional knowledge. But if, on the other hand, they are mere men of learning, at home with the fathers of Nice or Ephesus, conversant with the opinions of Basil, and Gregory, and Augustine, but ignorant of the feelings of Manchester and Birmingham and the opinions of the nineteenth century, they will not be able to rule our great commercial and political communities.

And now having seen the precedents of the Church Catholic

on one hand, and the requirements of the English Episcopate on the other, we shall be in a position to give a fair judgment on the particular scheme for the extension of the episcopate which it is the object of these pages to recommend.

That the Bishops of the Church of England may continue to be men of eminence, having weight with the country at large and with the Clergy in particular, the number of them must not be greatly increased. Here and there an overgrown diocese may be divided, but sees after the model of the 466 African sees in the time of Augustine, or the 400 of Asia Minor, or any approach to this, are not to be thought of.*

That the Bishops of the Church of England may continue to hold their constitutional place in Parliament, and legislate with the temporal Peers for the welfare of the commonwealth and Church, their number must not be greatly enlarged.

That the proper accompaniments of a Bishop's see, such as a cathedral, a Dean and Chapter, a suitable residence, a sufficient maintenance, and so on, may not be wanting, the number of sees must not be greatly multiplied.

That the Bishops may conveniently consult together, and act together, and that unity of purpose and harmony of execution in the government of their dioceses may be preserved, and that the chance of heresy or other grave scandal may be avoided, the number of Bishops must not be much increased.

And that unnecessary difficulties may not be interposed in the way of required changes, that a course alien to the habits of the English Church and the inherited opinions of the English people, may not unnecessarily be urged upon their acceptance, and that existing arrangements may not wantonly be disregarded, a large number of new sees must not be proposed to the Legislature, as the necessary condition of any required reform.

On the other hand, the due discipline of the Church must not be sacrificed to any other considerations. The honour of Christ and the welfare of Christ's flock are at stake. The people, too, must have in full sufficiency that oversight and those episcopal ministrations which are their right, and on which their spiritual health depends. If the number of the Church's children in-

* For an account of the size and number of dioceses in different parts, *see* Bingham, book ix.

creases by God's blessing, as it has enormously increased in the last century, the supply of the children's bread must be increased in proportion.

Nor, again, must the chief overseers of the flock of Christ serve tables. They must not, by the multiplicity of offices of a secular or unimportant character thrust upon them, be impeded in the higher and holier part of their great mission. The spirit which dictated the resolve of the twelve, WE WILL GIVE OURSELVES CONTINUALLY TO PRAYER, AND TO THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD, must be made possible for them to adopt as the spirit of their rule in the Church of God. Some means therefore must be found of easing the hands of our Bishops from the multiplicity of minor cares and duties which fritter away their time, and break down the freedom of their spirits. This could be done, doubtless, by tripling or quadrupling the number of Bishops' sees. But the objections to this are, as we have seen, insuperable.

One method of somewhat lightening their labours is being partially tried by some prelates at the present time, the introduction, namely, into their dioceses of retired colonial Bishops as Archdeacons or incumbents of parishes, and then availing themselves of their aid in confirmations and other episcopal functions. But that it would be very detrimental to the colonial Churches, and very unpalatable to the clergy at home, if such a course were to become general, and that there is a want of due order in such make-shift arrangements, which, however excusable on an emergency, are inexcusable as a system, is too obvious to require any argument to prove it.

Another plan would be the adoption of Suffragan Bishops under the Act 26 *Henric. Oct.* But to this again many objections have been brought forward. Archdeacon Hale tells us that such "Suffragan Bishops are an order of Bishops able to officiate anywhere," *i. e.* in any diocese of the province, *with* commission revocable at pleasure, but at no time or place *without* ('Extens. of Minist.' p. 97). If this be so, the arrangement would be as objectionable as the habitual employment of Colonial Bishops would be. There is great probability that such Bishops would clash with the existing dignitaries of the Church, Deans, Archdeacons, and such like, and that their jurisdiction would be as obnoxious to the parochial Clergy

as to them. To the Archdeacons, who by the existing constitution of the Church are second in authority only to the bishop, it must be a most unpleasant circumstance to have an additional master thus set over them; and the parochial Clergy would doubtless dislike this multiplication of superiors. It would also be a very great evil if there were to be even a small number of men of episcopal rank floating about the Church without fixed duties, possibly holding extreme opinions, possibly indiscreet and party men, who would be amenable to no jurisdiction because they were unattached, and would be capable of doing harm because they bore the honoured title of Bishops. Further, it may be remarked that the least efficient and the least energetic occupants of sees will usually be those least aware of the wants of their diocese and most jealous of any assistance; so that under the Suffragan system, where the want of help is the greatest, help will be least likely to be given. Any plan, therefore, which is designed, not merely for the personal ease of the Bishop but for the good of the diocese, should provide for the application of the required remedy, irrespectively of the views of the individual holding the episcopal office. If, too, the English system of large dioceses is continued, help to our Bishops must be not the exception but the universal rule.

Now, there does appear to be a very simple and obvious way in which the requirements of the Church may be fully satisfied at the smallest expense of money, without any disturbance of existing relations, without any startling innovations, without any breach of Church order, without any departure from the precedents of the Church Catholic in her best days, and in accordance with the spirit and practice of the English Church. Let the Archdeacons receive episcopal consecration and become fully, as they already are partially, Chorepiscopi. You will have at once a sufficient body of helpers, each with a defined area and jurisdiction, each already used to act with a definite authority over the Clergy, and with subordination to the Bishop. The Bishops' hands will be eased at once of a great mass of unimportant but burdensome labour, which will be better done by those on the spot, while they will be free to discharge more efficiently the higher functions of their Office to the great benefit of the Church. They will still be THE BISHOPS of their respective dioceses, THE BISHOPS of the Church representing in

Parliament, in Convocation, in synod, in society, the collective wisdom and piety of the faithful; while the Chorepiscopi, acting like curates under their rector's guidance, will perform a multitude of ministrations to the comfort of the flock, to the maintenance of discipline, and to the general strengthening of the Church. The kind of offices which they would perform would be confirmations and (as now) Visitations when the Bishop of the diocese did not confirm or visit; consecrations of churchyards and of churches when called upon to do so by the Bishop; presiding over synods of the Clergy of the archdeaconry when the Bishop was not present; exercising discipline, if by God's mercy discipline should be revived; perhaps giving faculties for certain specified objects; and generally carrying out the directions of the Bishop. In the event of the illness or infirmity of the Bishop, more would of course devolve upon them, such as ordinations—say by license from the Bishop or Metropolitan—and there would be this immense advantage, that in such cases the work of the diocese would not be impeded, nor would strangers unknown to the clergy be introduced, but the work of the diocese would flow as nearly as possible in its accustomed channel.

The necessity of episcopal resignations would also thus be removed.

As regards the titles of these episcopal Archdeacons, they might take them from the place which gives the title to the archdeaconry, or they might continue to be called Archdeacons, just as they did when they became Presbyters instead of Deacons. And as regards the amount of income requisite, a sum of 500*l.* per annum would probably be quite sufficient if the object is kept steadily in view of supplying the Diocesans with episcopal curates to lighten their labours, and meet the wants of their people. As all archdeaconries are endowed by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners up to 200*l.* per annum, and some have larger endowments of their own, it could not be very difficult to make up the required amount.

If some such scheme as the above could be carried out, it would seem to combine all the advantages of the opposite systems of large and small dioceses. It would multiply the working hands without multiplying the controlling heads of the Church. It would give a sufficiency of episcopal ministrations

to the increasing population without the risk of weakening the influence of the Bishops by raising inferior persons to the highest posts of ecclesiastical government. It would supply an admirable school for training persons to be Bishops of sees, and give to those whose duty it is to select Bishops an opportunity of judging who were most fit for the office. It would greatly diminish the temptation to make young men Bishops, and would enable the elder to regulate the amount of their work according to their strength, without their dioceses suffering from it. And if they are in the right who think that a great subdivision of dioceses is an inevitable necessity in the English Church, such an arrangement, while it will not precipitate, will gently prepare the way for it, whenever, in the counsels of Almighty God, the time for such a change is ripe.*

ARTHUR HERVEY.

---

* The scheme here recommended is nearly identical with that ably advocated by the Rev. P. Menzies Sankey in letters to the 'Guardian' of Dec. 27, 1865, and Feb. 21, 1866. *See* also 'Letter to the Lord Bishop of Ely, by Lord Arthur Hervey.' Murray, 1866.

ESSAY III.

THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE PRIESTHOOD.

By R. PAYNE SMITH, D.D.,

Canon of Christchurch, and Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY III.

Test of doctrine, and method of its application. Historical test especially necessary to enable us to judge of questions of Church organisation.

Three several errors of those who neglect it. The Agape a proof that practices possessing Scriptural authority may be fitly abolished. Episcopacy and the Priesthood, how far essential to the Church; what Scriptural warrant for them, and for the ordination and maintenance of the clergy. The Diaconate only nominally retained in the Church of England.

Duties of the clergy: (1) to teach; (2) to administer the sacraments, &c. Necessity of learning in the clergy, in order that they may be fit to teach. St. Chrysostom's opinion that baptism can be administered only by the clergy, overruled by the Church. Moral obligations incumbent upon the Church's ministers.

Two main deflections from primitive model: the first consummated by Gregory VII., the second by the Council of Trent. Modern Romish theory that the priest has the power (1) of reproducing Christ's sacrifice; (2) of forgiving sins. Tridentine doctrine of absolution more moderate than that taught in popular manuals.

Power of the keys. Isolation of Romish clergy. Indelibility of orders. Power of clergy to decree doctrines. Presence and influence of laity in General Councils. No new doctrine may be decreed in them. Tertullian's appeal to the customs of Apostolic Churches. Change in the appeal, owing to settlement of the Canon of Scripture in fourth century. Reason why settlement satisfactory as regards the New, and unsatisfactory as regards the Old Testament. Appeal of Church of England to Scripture only. Knowledge of Scripture, how to be attained. Case of those whose convictions are unsettled. Conclusion.

THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE PRIESTHOOD.

FROM the position occupied by the English Church, one of the most important tests of a doctrine is its history. Holding as we do middle ground between the claim of the individual to decide absolutely for himself according to what seems to him at the moment to be the literal sense of Holy Scripture, and the theory of the Romish Church, that the laity must accept fully and without reserve whatever the priesthood teaches them, we assert that a due regard is to be paid to the decisions of councils and to the evidence of the Fathers, while at the same time we make God's Holy Word our one sole and sufficient final authority in all matters of faith. We neglect, therefore, nothing in bygone times. Whatever may help us to the right understanding of the Scriptures, that we gladly make use of; and as it is reasonable that the ages which most closely followed upon the ministry of the Apostles should be the best witnesses to their doctrine, we regard the testimony of the primitive Church as second in importance only to the Bible. We do not, indeed, claim for it any inherent authority, but we give it the first place as evidence in settling what is the right sense of Holy Scripture. But neither do we reject anything of any age which may help us in searching out the true meaning of Holy Writ; and in some branches of learning—as in textual criticism—we should even give more weight to a Tregelles, a Tischendorf, or a Scrivener, than to any Father, scarcely even excepting those of the great Alexandrian school. We may even add that, as regards the exegesis of the Old Testament, we can claim for the Fathers but very little authority; for their ignorance of the Hebrew language disqualified them from the task of expounding a work of which their sole knowledge was gained through the medium of a very indifferent translation.

The principle of our Church is that in every controversy the

Word of God is supreme: but by the Word of God we do not mean every absurdity which ignorant and foolish men thrust upon it, but the one true and correct sense of what is therein written. And to attain to this we must diligently use every help that God has given us. We must search and compare manuscripts, in order that we may discover as nearly as possible what Evangelists and Apostles really wrote. We must study Greek and Hebrew, grammar and philology, and examine into the use of every word found in the Bible, and follow these words into the cognate languages, and see how they are employed even by profane writers, in order that we may in the next place learn what is the right meaning of the genuine text. And finally, we must test our conclusions by the evidence of the great writers of the Church. We must ask, Is this interpretation one known and accepted in primitive times? Was it generally received then, or held only by some one or more writers? If not primitive, when did it first crop up? Who started it? Out of what did it grow? What are the various stages of its progress? In what institutions was it embodied, and at what date or dates? What opposition was made to it? and how overcome? What were its effects, good or bad? Did it lead to holiness or to sin? Did it make the Church more spiritual or more worldly? When thus we know our case, then to the judge, if this last appeal be still necessary. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the history of a doctrine is enough. Heartily and with confidence we condemn all upstart and new-fangled tenets. "The old Fathers," "the good Fathers in the primitive Church," condemn by their silence. Things do not change so rapidly as to make it probable that the doctrines taught in the times which immediately followed the Apostles are different from those which the Apostles taught: but the truth gradually was overlaid with error, and doctrines never heard of till the ninth or tenth century can be no part of the true faith of Christ: their novelty puts them out of court, and condemns them as mere impostors and false claimants, with no titles or documents to produce in their support. Even doctrines unheard of till the fifth or sixth century are terribly damaged by wanting the "Apostolical succession." There must be very strong scriptural testimony to compensate for the want of primitive authority. For there is in he New Testament a crucial test of doctrine. Not a word

about Quod semper et ubique;—the most impracticable test ever propounded. It does not ask how many have received the doctrine, nor in what places it has been held, nor does it suggest that if a doctrine has been lost anywhere or abandoned it is therefore untrue. Still less does it say that the true faith is that which has been received ab omnibus. No doctrine has ever been received by everybody, and Vincent of Lerins' rule expresses what ought to be,—what would be the case, if we were all perfect, and living under a perfect state of things, rather than what really is. Far different is the test put forth in the Bible itself. It says that the true faith is that which was *once for all* delivered to the saints. Contend, says St. Jude, τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει. If you cannot prove your doctrine by the testimony of Holy Writ, you cannot prove it at all, unless St. Jude be mistaken. And as for discoveries being made in Holy Writ, and new doctrines invented out of it, the very idea is monstrous. Who can suppose that the primitive Church was destitute either of the knowledge or of the practical appreciation of any of the saving truths of the Gospel! What does St. Paul say upon this point? He declares that he "kept back nothing that was profitable" from those to whom he preached, and that he was pure from their blood only "because he had not shunned to declare unto them the whole counsel of God." (Acts xx. 20, 27.)

For practical purposes,—for the one great practical purpose of leading a holy Christian life,—we need none of these secondary helps, so essential where the truth of a doctrine is to be established. Those two great articles, in which St. Paul summed up Christianity—"repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ"—are everywhere too plainly taught for the man to miss them who earnestly sets himself to use his Bible as his guide to heaven. Our Lord, too, has expressly promised that he who heartily endeavours to do God's will shall know of the doctrine (John vii. 17); not of course in the way of controversy, to enable him to settle as a judge for others whether it be true or not, but in the way of practice for himself. If anywhere he has so misunderstood Scripture as to be in danger of attaining only to a low standard of godliness his remedy will be perseverance in a holy life. By acting according to whatever degree of knowledge he possesses, he will win his way, by the

Holy Spirit's aid, to higher degrees of knowledge experimentally. This practical use of the Bible is a very different thing from its use in settling articles of faith, and it is strange that any should ever have confounded the two.

For proof or disproof of a doctrine we need every possible help, but not equally for all doctrines. Some, as we have already said—perhaps all of those truths necessary to salvation—are so clearly taught in Holy Scripture, that any one who reads it carefully, reverently, and with prayer, can scarcely mistake them. It is not so with the outward organisation of the Church. Unless a man know a great deal of Church history it will be impossible for him to arrive at any sound conclusion as to the powers and duties of the priesthood.

For suppose that we could erase from our minds all our historical knowledge, and were then to compare what we read in the New Testament—as for instance in 1 Cor. xii., xiv.—with what exists at present, how could we feel reasonably certain that we had preserved everything essential for Church government? For we have not retained a single one of the offices distinctly entitled "ministrations of the Spirit" by St. Paul in one of the most important scenes of his labours. Why has that ecclesiastical organisation incidentally mentioned by the same apostle in his Epistles to Timothy and Titus become the rule of the Christian community,* while the richer organisation of the Corinthian Church, with its more abundant charismata, has passed away?

In short, those who ignore the test of history are liable to fall into three several errors. They may insist upon restoring what was temporary: they may assert that there is nothing essential in the external organisation of the Church: or granting this, they may affirm that nothing may be added to it, and so deny the Church in each successive age all power of perfecting and adapting its organisation to meet present needs.

---

* Thus at the Council of Nice, A.D. 325, no other church organisation was known than that of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. It is curious, however, to find that this threefold division was generally connected with the angelic hierarchy. Thus in Canon xxx of that Council the bishop is said to hold our Lord's place, the presbyter (πρεσβύτερον) the throne of the seraph, and the deacon that of the cherub. So Clem. Alex. 'Strom.,' 6, 13, calls them "copies of the angelic glory." In after time, when, by the multiplication of inferior orders, there were nine grades of the clergy, they were still arranged with reference to the ninefold division of the heavenly hierarchy, as gathered by writers like the pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite from St. Paul's Epistles.

I. The first is the error of those who style themselves the Apostolic Church. Starting with the assumption that everything mentioned in the Bible is equally necessary, they must needs have apostles and angels, prophets and evangelists, gifts of healing, of miracles, of tongues. But why do we not find these things in the sub-apostolic age? And after all, theirs can be but a partial restoration. Who could hear now to celebrate, or be edified by celebrating, the Lord's Supper reclining at table as at its first institution? or in the middle of a meal, after a walk, according to the example of the risen Saviour? or from house to house, as in Acts ii. 46? at midnight with long conversation, as in Acts xx. 7, 11? or at the end of a social banquet, to which the members clubbed their contributions, as in 1 Cor. xi.? For three centuries the Agape and the Lord's Supper were never separated. In the catacombs of Rome—one of our most trustworthy witnesses to the customs of primitive times—the Agape is constantly depicted, the Lord's Supper once only, if the work of Aringhi may be trusted, and then dubiously in a symbolical way. In A.C. 330 the council of Gangra anathematised every one who treated the Agape with disrespect; and yet in that very century the "love-meal," the representative of the supper at which our Lord instituted the Holy Eucharist, was abolished. We still call it the Lord's Supper, and yet the supper, after existing for four centuries, has for fourteen centuries been discontinued. In St. Augustine's time it was still usual on Maunday Thursday to have a common meal in the church, and then to partake of the sacrament in remembrance of the practice of primitive times.*

* Augustine Epist. 54, ad Januarium. See also Concilium Carthag. iii. c. xxix. Januarius, it seems, was troubled in mind by the words "Likewise after Supper." Ought we not always to sup before partaking of the Holy Communion? St. Augustine answers, that it is quite certain that our Lord at its first institution gave the Holy Sacrament to the Apostles after a meal, and that such was the apostolical custom is proved by 1 Cor. xi. But he argues that the Church nevertheless might fitly order that the sacrament should be taken fasting; and says that, excepting this one day, such was the practice in his time. It must be remembered that Maunday Thursday came in the most solemn week of the Lenten fast; and some therefore seem to have doubted of the propriety of breaking the fast. To meet this objection he recommends an evening communion—"post refectionem quæ hora nona fit;"—and as to the question of taking the communion fasting, his answer is in the spirit of St. Paul, that such matters must be left to the conscience of each individual—for he says, Wherefore we compel no one to breakfast before that Lord's supper, but neither do we dare to forbid any: "quapropter neminem cogimus ante dominicam illam cœnam prandere, sed nulli etiam contradicere audemus." For St. Paul, *see* Gal. v. 6, 13, 18.

Upon what principle was this enormous change made? We grant that it was in obedience to that cardinal rule given by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xiv. 40, and based by him upon the very nature of God, *ib.* 33. But though the Agape was thus rightly abolished, what utter unreason is it to speak of an evening communion, celebrated decently and in order, as a "sacrilege," ('Bluebook of Eit. Com.' Q. 2904), because people would have had their dinner, and drunk wine or beer before it. (*ib.* 2905.) Is the poor man's beer sinful because it is cheap? or was it as a fact the meal that St. Paul condemned? Most certainly not. It was the noise and disorder of certain of the communicants. Were all Christians for three centuries guilty of sacrilege? Was St. Augustine guilty of sacrilege every Maunday Thursday? Dare any one assert that our Lord instituted the Holy Sacrament in a manner which is now sacrilege? It is a miserable superstition which makes Christ's gifts depend upon the accidents of the body. Let everything be done reverently, and for edification; but our Church teaches us that our edification is a spiritual process: "the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received *by the faithful* in the Lord's Supper." But we have those among us now whose whole teaching and mode of thought about the Lord's Supper is materialistic, and of whom we may well ask "How turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?"

Still no one, we suppose, would wish to restore the meal before the Communion, though it was so instituted by our Lord, and practised in primitive times. As so instituted and practised, it must be right in itself, and was even the fittest mode of partaking of the Lord's Supper in those days. But other modes may be more fitting now; and the early morning communion is of all most grateful, most refreshing, and full of heavenly calm. But we must not on this account limit the freedom of the Church. The example of our Lord, and the custom of the early Church are a sufficient justification of evening communions, wheresoever any portion of the people are practically debarred from participating in the benefits of this Holy Sacrament by its being celebrated in the morning only.

II. We use the Agape, the meal before the communion, however, only as a plain proof that a restoration of the customs and

practices of primitive times is not in all cases either desirable or possible. Principles remain, but their outward expression may and must vary. Still, secondly, in every institution there is something essential. An institution is the embodiment of a principle, and any such change as makes it cease to represent that principle, is an injury to the perfectness of Christian truth. This essential element then may be denied: and such, as regards the priesthood, seems to be the error of the Plymouth Brethren. Because every Christian is a priest, they would have no clergy. As well might they have no Lord's day, because we ought to serve God with all our strength every day of the week. As well have no churches, because God dwells with him that is of a contrite and humble spirit. (Is. lvii. 15.) The Church of Rome equally with the Plymouth Brethren holds the great truth that the sacerdotium interius—the priesthood of the heart—belongs to all the faithful, (Cat. Concil. Trid. ii. vii. Q. 23); though in practice she virtually does away with that right of personal access to our Lord, without any human mediator, which this priesthood bestows. But while we put the highest possible value upon the personal priesthood of every true Christian, we nevertheless affirm that there is sufficient scriptural warrant also for the principle, that certain persons are to be specially set apart for ministering publicly in the congregation, (Acts xiii. 2; Rom. x. 15; 1 Cor. ix. 14; Gal. vi. 6; James iii. 1 etc.), and that they are entrusted with certain functions not committed to the laity.

III. The third error is that of those who deny the right of a national Church to adapt rites, and ceremonies, and institutions, to the edification of its own members. (Article XX.) Even the Jewish Church had this power, and our Lord celebrated the passover not according to the law of Moses, but according to regulations of modern date. How much more necessary is it for the well-being of the Church Catholic,—a Church therefore not confined to one climate or country, but commanded to spread throughout the whole world, and destined to last till Christ's second advent,—that she should be able to diversify, and remodel her institutions! An inelastic organisation would be altogether unsuitable under such conditions. Principles she must retain: her forms she may alter as she will, provided only that she alters them wisely, reverently, and well.

Yet there are many difficult questions here as to the proper exercise of such a power. For instance, has a national Church the right to abolish episcopacy, considering the amount of scriptural warrant for it, its general prevalence in primitive times, its importance for government, and the great truth it represents of the Church's unity under its one sole Lord, Jesus Christ? To discuss such a question properly would require great care and thoughtfulness. We should have accurately to examine what was so of the essence of a Church that if lost, it was a Church no longer: and what so of the essence of a Church, as to be requisite only for its health and perfectness. The conclusion could scarcely be other than that episcopacy came under the second category, and that a national Church may abolish it: though in so doing she suffers, as we believe, a great loss, and stops short of the primitive model. Or in other words, a national Church has the *power* to abolish episcopacy, yet inasmuch as it is *de bene esse* of the Church, she has not the right to do so, if by right you mean not merely what is legal, but what is fitting to be done.

The word essential is, in fact, used in various meanings. Baptism and the Lord's Supper are generally necessary to salvation, but they are not necessary to every soul under all circumstances. Canonists have carefully distinguished various cases in which baptism is not indispensable: and neither we nor the Church of Rome admit young children to the Lord's Supper. (Cat. ii. iv. 60.) In a far higher sense repentance, faith, sanctification, are essential: for salvation is impossible without them even with the sacraments: and most essential of all is our blessed Saviour's own work. But a ministry is essential to the Church only as generally requisite to her well-being, just as the Lord's Day is essential, and places in which Christians can meet for common prayer and preaching and the celebration of the sacraments are essential. Were there no Lord's Day, no churches, no clergy, a miracle—but only a miracle—could keep Christianity in existence. Grant that these things are necessary only because of our weakness, our fallen state, our sinfulness. What of that? If man had not fallen, there would have been no need of Christianity at all. Our Saviour came to save us from the consequences of sin.

We assert then that a ministry is necessary for the Church,

because without it the Christian religion would decay, and finally disappear. It is essential to its organisation, and to its efficient discharge of its duties; but we believe that it is not necessary that it should be in all things exactly the same as the primitive model. The Christian ministry does not exist for itself, but for the good of the community. Its justification is that it supplies certain definite needs of Christ's body. If those needs are supplied, that is all that is required. But we may fearlessly assert that it is at least probable that that form of Church government which was early adopted, and has generally prevailed, will be found to conduce most to the spiritual edification of Christians; and that any branch of the Church which departs from this model runs the risk of omitting something essential to its well-being. A body partially maimed may yet in other respects be full of vigorous life; but it is only by "the effectual working in the measure of every part," that "the whole body maketh increase unto the edifying of itself in love." (Eph. iv. 16.)

Still our final appeal is not to primitive antiquity, however much we may value its testimony, but to the Bible. We believe that the New Testament contains every principle that the Church will ever require for its guidance, and we use the testimony of primitive times, not as a co-ordinate authority, but as a safeguard from error and one-sidedness, being warned in the New Testament itself, that the unlearned violently twist (στρεβλοῦσιν) both St. Paul's epistles and the other Scriptures, to their own loss. (2 Pet. iii. 16.) The usefulness, therefore, of the ministry would not suffice for its warrant unless it had scriptural authority. But this authority exists. The ordination of St. Paul and Barnabas by the laying on of the hands of the prophets and teachers at Antioch, is not a mere historical fact, but involves the whole principle of ordination. There was apparently no bishop then at Antioch, but the whole Church, with whom finally all authority rests, and whose representative is the bishop, exercised the right of ordination. St. Paul, together with the presbytery, next lays hands on Timothy, in the presence probably of the whole community. (1 Tim. iv. 14; vi. 12; 2 Tim. i. 6.) Timothy is in the same way to ordain others, (1 Tim. v. 22), and men thus ordained are to have their support provided for them by the laity, (Matt. x. 10; 1 Cor. ix. 11, 14). There is even warrant for our present three-

fold division of the ministry, though but for the evidence of sub-apostolic times we might have imagined that many other offices mentioned in the New Testament were equally essential with those which we have retained. The warrant for these things, belonging as they do to the outer organisation of the Church, and not to those truths necessary for salvation committed to her keeping, is given in the way of general principles, and not of express command. And no other way was so fit, remembering as we ought to do, that the New Testament was given as the guide of a universal Church throughout all time, during which she must adapt herself to an infinity of external circumstances. But in the modification and application of these general principles, it would be folly to suppose that every particular Church will use equal wisdom. Of communities, as of men, it is ever the case that some so use God's gifts as to earn with them ten talents, while others stop short at five, or at two. It may even be that the talent may be so misused, as finally to be taken away. One object of the seven messages to the Churches of Asia evidently was thus to show that each Church, as well as each individual, has its own probation, and comes nearer to, or departs farther from, the full measure of perfectness. (Compare Rev. ii. 4, 9, 14; iii. 8, &c.)

Using the New Testament thus as our store-house of principles, we farther find in what way the Church is to provide the means for the maintenance of the ministry, of the poor, and generally of every good work. Every Lord's day each Christian is to lay by him in store a definite portion of his income during the week. (1 Cor. xvi. 2.) Were this order conscientiously observed we should need neither endowments, nor poor laws, nor government grants, nor rates in aid of education, nor missionary societies, nor societies for spiritual aid, or for the promotion of Christian knowledge. A parish must be richly endowed indeed for its endowments and the poor rates together to amount to the sum spent by the labouring class alone in beer-shops, to the detriment alike of body and soul. Of the classes above them, the two hundred and fortieth part of their incomes may fairly be calculated at a million and a half. Were the whole community to set apart the tenth of its income for pious and benevolent uses, not only would the ministers, the schools, the sick, the poor, the widows and orphans of every denomination

be amply provided for, but there would be a surplus for missionary and general use, so large that it would be difficult to expend it wisely.

To expect the Christian Church, however, to act up to the standard of the New Testament is chimerical. Endowments, poor laws, government grants, have robbed us of the grace of giving, and the clergy, instead of devoting their time to the work of the ministry and to prayer, have to manage "charities," as they are called, and to beg trifles from door to door for the support of their schools and parochial institutions. St. Paul would not hear of "any gatherings when he came," nor ought such gatherings to be any part of the presbyter's duty. It is the office of the deacon to take care of and distribute the funds of the Church.

Practically we have no diaconate; the word is applied with us to candidates for priest's orders. This is a modification for the worse. While retaining the name we have lost the reality of one of the three orders of the Christian ministry, and are so far as completely maimed as presbyterian churches are maimed by the loss of the episcopate. The alienation from our Church of so many of the laity, especially among the trading classes, is the loss we suffer. Were St. Paul's principles carried out, every parish would need several deacons to manage its common funds, and attend to the sick, the poor, and the schools. They would be chosen from the most godly and trustworthy members of the community, and would compact it firmly together. At present the presbyter and churchwarden perform the deacon's duties after a fashion by which even the churchwarden is generally excluded from his legal functions. As for the presbyter, he well knows what a miserable part of his labours are those gatherings, with which St. Paul would absolutely have nothing to do, and which are inappropriate, and even an indignity to his office.

There is scriptural warrant, therefore, for the existence of a ministry entirely devoted to sacred duties, warrant also for its consisting of various orders; express command for its maintenance, and ample means provided. We have also asserted that it supplies certain needs of the Church. What are these? In other words what are the duties of the Christian ministry?

Our Church teaches us that they are twofold. The first to

preach the pure Word of God, the second to administer the sacraments duly according to Christ's ordinance. (Art. XIX.) What says Holy Scripture? What is the testimony of primitive antiquity as to these things? The appeal to these "old ways" is the more necessary now because preaching the Gospel is not at present in fashion. Clergymen who attach importance to it are treated as beings supremely ridiculous, who had their little day a few years ago, but are now entirely gone by. But when we turn from the sacerdotal literature, which now issues from the press in floods, to St. Paul's Epistles, we find a very different state of thought prevailing. "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." (1 Cor. i. 17.) "We preach the Word of Faith." (Rom. x. 8.) "We preach Christ crucified." (1 Cor. i. 23.) His leading idea, the one duty he recognised, was preaching; nay, in so doing he did but follow a higher example. "Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom." (Matt. iv. 23.) The risen Saviour even declared that the one object of all revelation was "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached." (Luke xxiv. 47.) And when we come to express commands it is still the same, "A bishop must be apt to teach." (1 Tim. iii. 2.) Teaching in every possible way is the highest duty of the ministry, and the verdict of primitive times entirely agrees in this with the Word of God.

Thus Cyprian, the very model of a bishop, says—"the bishop must not only teach, but also learn, because he teaches the better who daily grows and profits by learning better things."* The one idea in Chrysostom's treatise on the Priesthood is that every one called to the office must be eloquent as well as versed in the Scriptures, that he may be able to preach and teach the truth and refute heresies. It would be superfluous, however, to bring numerous quotations in proof of what no one can deny, and I shall therefore adduce but one more testimony: St. Ambrose excuses himself for writing a treatise on morals by saying, "We cannot escape the duty of teaching, because this is an obligation imposed upon us by our ordination."† It

* "Oportet enim episcopum non tantum docere sed et discere, quia ille melius docet, qui quotidie crescit et proficit discendo meliora."—*Ep. ad Pomp. ad fin.*

† "Effugere non possimus officium docendi quod nobis imposuit sacerdotii necessitudo."—*De Off.*, l. i. 1.

would indeed be a great mistake to suppose that our pulpit ministrations exhaust our office of teaching: far from it. But it is one of our most powerful means of usefulness, and we as clergy of the Church of England are untrue to our Church if we regard it as our secondary duty, and not as our first. For when we were ordained the Bishop put—not a mass book, but—a Bible into the hand of every one, and said, "Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the Holy Sacraments." The preaching God's Word is put first, the administration of the sacraments, as in Article XIX., is the second duty of the priesthood.

But, while human nature remains such as it is, it is impossible that this duty of teaching can be adequately performed except by men specially trained for the purpose, and who afterwards have both the will and the opportunity for study. Teachers who cannot understand the Scriptures in their original tongues, nor read with some degree of ease the writings of the old Fathers, can be at best but blind guides; but in these days, when so many of the laity do study, it does not follow that their hearers will be blind also. And whenever the clergy of any Church neglect "the reading of the Scriptures, and such other studies as help to the knowledge of them"—an obligation imposed upon our clergy by their ordination vows—necessarily the same luxuriant crop of false doctrines and puerilities and superstitions will again spring up which in the middle ages was the result of the general ignorance which then prevailed. Like causes ever produce like effects. A learned clergy is absolutely necessary, if the Church is to continue sound in the Faith. Without learning, the clergy are at the mercy of whatever happens to be at the moment the noisiest party, and will be carried unresistingly along by whatever "movement" happens to be in vogue. But the man who studies his Bible and has made himself acquainted with the history of the Church, and especially of the development of doctrine within her, is not thus at the mercy of every fashionable heresy. For he has a standard for his faith, and finds too many warnings in the past history of opinion to let himself drift with the stream.

Further, it is at least seemly that the public services of the Church should be confided to men especially set apart and ordained for their performance. Although laymen undoubtedly

took part in the services of the Corinthian Church, (1 Cor. xiv. 26, 31), yet the stress laid everywhere by St. Paul upon the validity of his own apostleship, and upon the gift conferred upon Timothy by the imposition of his hands, is a sufficient justification for the rule of primitive times, that none should publicly minister unless they were solemnly appointed thereto by the authority of the Church. Believing, as we do, that the New Testament is a storehouse of principles for the Church's guidance throughout all time, we regard the ordination of Barnabas and Paul—of whom the latter, at all events, had long before received the internal call by special revelation—as an express authority for the ordination of the clergy by the imposition of hands. (Acts xiii. 1-3.) And not only was this so ruled in primitive times, but there was a tendency to magnify the office excessively. Thus, passing over the rhetoric in St. Chrysostom's 'Treatise on the Priesthood,' we find him affirming that baptism and the Lord's Supper could be administered only by priests. Of his opinion, one-half has been rejected universally. The primary importance of baptism, the fact of its being administered only once in each person's lifetime, and the necessity often of administering it without delay in cases of sudden and dangerous illness: these and the like reasons have made canonists rule that water only and the use of our Lord's words are essential to the sacrament of baptism. Yet when in our first Prayer-books the rubrics were so worded as apparently to sanction the baptism of a sick child by any person whatsoever, this so offended the Puritan party that at the Hampton Court Conference it was ordered that "all those questions in private baptism that insinuate it to be done by women be taken away." * But as regards the Lord's Supper, and all public services, including Baptism, except in cases of emergency, it has from very early days been the universal rule that those only should minister them who have been especially ordained thereto.

And these alone—namely, to preach the Gospel and to ad-

* The statute law holds that lay-baptism is valid, and therefore the clergy, as the officers of a national church, are bound by statute-law to bury all persons at whose baptism water and our Lord's words have been used, and who have not subsequently been excommunicated. In case, however, of any child thus baptised being brought to the clergyman, the proper course apparently, having regard to our present rubrics, would be to use the conditional form of words provided at the end of the office for the private ministration of baptism.

minister the Holy Sacraments and other rites of the Church—are the functions of the clergy according to the doctrines of our Church and the judgment of the primitive Fathers. It is the duty, further, of the Bishop to maintain discipline within his diocese, to ordain fit persons to the ministry, and to perfect holy baptism by the imposition of his hands. But besides these duties we require much morally of the clergy as connected with their office of teaching; and therefore at their ordination the Bishop charges them as "messengers, watchmen, and stewards of the Lord, to teach and to premonish, to feed and provide for the Lord's family; to seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for his children who are in the midst of this naughty world, that they may be saved through Christ for ever."

These requirements follow from a view of the position of the clergy entirely distinct from that held by the Church of Rome. There, as we shall see hereafter, the clergy form a caste, separated from the laity by an impassable gulf, and invested with extraordinary powers for the performance of two special functions. With us, the Church consists not of the clergy, but of the whole company of faithful people, (Art. XIX.): some indeed with lay duties and some with spiritual, but not, therefore, divided into separate camps, but mutually perfecting one another. Devoted, then, specially to God's service, bound by solemn vows to the work of feeding Christ's heritage and winning souls for Him, the clergy ought themselves to be the complete example of the Christian life and the pattern of everything which the layman equally should strive to be. It is the glory of our Church that so many laymen do attain to so high a standard of Christian duty; but it is especially the duty of the clergy in their own persons, their homes, and families, to set this standard; and it was this which conferred on each minister, in his parish, the once-honoured name of parson, as qui personam gerit ecclesiæ, the representative of the graces and virtues of the Christian Church. Most detestable is the view that the clergy are a sort of spiritual police, whose duties are simply to baptise, marry, and bury, and save the country's money by keeping a sort of order in their parishes. Really, what the Lord's day is to the other days of the week, what the church is to the private house, that should the clergy-

man be to the layman. Not something distinct in kind, but something more especially dedicated to God; more unworldly, more holy, more devoted to heavenly things. (1 Tim. vi. 11.)

But this duty imposes upon the clergy very serious obligations. Men sometimes ask why they should be debarred from amusements in which a layman may fittingly take part. But why not—*a pari*—give a dance in a church, or hold an archery meeting on a Sunday? If a building set apart for God's service be desecrated by an innocent amusement, can a man set apart for God's service act in all cases exactly as a layman may do? If every one would be shocked by the place where the Holy Sacrament is administered being associated with things light and trivial, as by the singing of an opera there, can the man solemnly set apart to minister that Holy Sacrament himself be right in frequenting operas and theatres? No doubt this principle requires modification, for it is a necessity of our nature to unbend; the priest is still but a man, and body and mind need not rest only but recreation. Things set apart for God's service can be separated entirely from all other associations; but human nature would give way were it always upon the strain. The anxious cares and responsibilities of his office, the incessant labours, the sad and painful sights which he daily witnesses among the poor and the sick, these would in a few years entirely destroy all freshness and elasticity of mind if the priest abstained from all relaxation.

But even in his recreations there must be a gravity and seemliness fitting to his office. He has undertaken to be the example of the Christian life: it is his business to declare God's message, to enforce God's laws, urge His commands upon the conscience, denounce His righteous judgments, and encourage the penitent by the gracious promises of the Gospel. Can any one who has undertaken such an office expect to lead the life of an ordinary layman? If so, there would be no need of his office. Men trafficking and busy on this world's mart would be just as suitable as himself for the discharge of his duties. These men may be personally most pious; but in the services of God's house we wish to rise far above the atmosphere of worldly associations. Even among the Jews, the Levites had no inheritance among the tribes, that they might not farm or traffic; and though the prophets belonged to no special class,

yet as a general rule even they congregated together in schools, and devoted themselves to the office of preaching. And similarly St. Paul absolutely required it of Timothy that he should give himself wholly to his ministry.

The duties, then, of the Christian minister are to teach, of which duty preaching forms an important element; to administer the sacraments; and generally to do all in his power to win souls for Christ and maintain a high standard of Christian living. Now, to test this statement fully by the history of the priesthood would require a large volume; but such a test would certainly show that this view of the ministry, as held by our Church and by the great writers of our Communion, agrees in the main with that held in primitive times. There would, indeed, be found, even in early days, many tendencies to make the clergy into a caste, to magnify excessively their powers, to give them many dangerous immunities, and even to free them from heavy moral obligations. Such tendencies always have existed, and probably always will do so; for vanity, lust of power, exclusiveness, caste feelings, and the like are only too natural, and it is not to be expected that the clergy will entirely escape them. Certainly, they exist now, and are actively at work. They have even a good side, being to some extent prompted by a deep sense of the responsibility of the priest's office as the bearer of a message from God to each man's soul. No man can think very highly of an office and devote himself ardently to it without incurring the risk of arrogating to it too much. But they have also an evil side; for they lead on to the notion that the special functions of the clergy are of more value than the fruits of the Spirit in the heart. The means of grace are extolled above the ends for which those means were given. Religion gradually grows more objective and materialistic, instead of that due subordination of the external to the internal, which is so distinctive a mark of the teaching of our Blessed Lord, being maintained. And thus finally a state of things is the result, prejudicial to the usefulness of the clergy and ruinous to their own spiritual life. The history of the Church plainly teaches this. It is one long warning how the clergy have again and again wrecked their influence by endeavouring to be lords over Christ's heritage instead of ensamples to the flock.

We have time, however, to notice only the two main

deflections of the clergy from the primitive and scriptural model.

The first took place upon the fall of the Roman Empire, when, by the rapid decay of learning, the clergy became the sole depositaries of whatever knowledge remained. The result was inevitable. However strong may be the hands, the thinking head, itself powerless, must control them, and the supremacy of the clergy finally consummated by Gregory VII. was the victory of knowledge over brute force. The forgery of the Decretals may have made the victory more easy, but those who can read and write must rule over those who can do neither. When one order of men could alone draw a statute and interpret it; could alone write wills and prove them; could alone keep accounts; could alone read the history of bygone days, and the writings of other men; when, finally, they alone could read the Scriptures, and commentaries upon them, it is plain that they alone were qualified to be the judges, lawyers, magistrates, and treasurers of nations; were necessarily their statesmen, and their ambassadors, as well as their divines. The laity viewed with indignation their increasing wealth, their power, their immunities, but what could they do? The ignorant are ever superstitious; and, even to the stoutest-hearted, there were sure to be times of trouble and mental anguish, when in dismay they prostrated themselves at the sovereign Pontiff's feet, or bared their backs to the scourge in Canterbury Cathedral. These triumphs of the priesthood made the hatred felt for them by the laity more intense: but it was powerless. It was only when learning revived, and the laity ceased to thank God that no son of theirs save the bishop could pen a line, that the hour of their deliverance had arrived. Then everywhere, whatever else might be spared, they destroyed, in pictures and painted windows, the head of Thomas à Becket, because, rightly or wrongly, it had become the symbol of the degradation of the laity before a tyrannical priesthood.

But it must be borne in mind that this supremacy of the clergy was something entirely different from the present claims of the Church of Rome. For it was not founded upon doctrine, but was the simple result of the ignorance of the laity. The learning of the clergy was not much absolutely, and as they wanted that corrective influence which the laity in better times

exercise upon them—for in the Church the clergy and laity mutually correct and perfect one another—the corruption alike of morals and doctrine quickly followed upon their ascendency. Their wealth and power led on to arrogancy, to luxury, to indolence, and so finally back to ignorance. Whatever there had been of real learning pined away. Superstition took the place of religion. The Bible ceased to be read, and every sort of folly and false doctrine took possession of the minds of clergy and laity alike.

But at length came the restoration of letters. The Greek Church had never plunged into so deep a slough of ignorance as the Latin, and at the capture of Constantinople by the Turks many learned men fled thence to Italy, carrying with them precious manuscripts saved from the ruin of their country. These manuscripts were the masterpieces of heathen genius, and the renascence which followed was as heathenish as can well be imagined, and those who dream of an age of learning freed from the trammels of religion may study its practical effects in the reign of that splendid but utter heathen, Pope Leo X. But probably these Greeks would not have awakened Europe but for the discovery of paper. Already in the fourteenth century we find that a coarse paper made of linen rags was in use at Oxford, and, as soon as the manufacture of it had so far advanced as to provide a cheap material for literary purposes, the art of printing followed as a matter of course. And with the revival of literature came the call from within the Church for reformation. All the better minds of laity, monks, and clergy were anxious for greater purity alike of morals and of faith. At Constance and at Trent numerous bishops laboured zealously for a return to primitive models, but unfortunately other agencies were at work. The heathenism of Rome, which in the person of her Pope, Leo X., had boasted that "the fable of Christ had served it in good stead," prevailed, and a new and uncatholic religion was established by the decrees of the Council of Trent.

If words were used in their right sense we could truly affirm that the work of our Church in the sixteenth century was not a re-formation, but the restoration of the primitive faith. No new dogma has been invented by Protestants, but they simply returned to the truth as it was held in the best and purest ages. Every doctrine taught in Holy Scripture our Church

reverently holds, and boldly appeals to the testimony of primitive times in proof that she has let go no single point of the faith entrusted to the Church's keeping. But while thus holding the whole catholic faith,* she protests both against those popular errors which had grown up in the ages of ignorance, and against that formal heresy which Rome decreed at Trent. For the Council of Trent placed the Church of Rome upon a new basis; a reformation took place there in the way of constructing something new. Ours was a Restoration of Belief, a return to the faith of those pure times which followed immediately upon the life and work of our Blessed Lord and of his disciples. Rome professedly discarded primitive times. The ablest and most subtle reasoner of the age acknowledges it. The great plea of England, he says, is Antiquity: that of Rome, Catholicity. But this catholicity requires two enormous concessions according to Dr. Newman's own view, namely, first of the truth of the theory of development and next of the infallibility of the Romish See.† That is to be catholic which Rome decrees to be catholic, even though it be but a nineteenth-century decree like that which added to the faith the monstrous dogma of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, enacted by the sole

* The common usage of modern times may be a sufficient apology for the employment of the phrase "Catholic faith," yet it involves a confusion of thought. The article of the Creed, "the Catholic Church," expresses a most important and vital truth. It is a standing protest against the usurpations of Rome. But "the Catholic Faith" is a phrase well nigh confined to the Western Church, and apparently makes the acceptance of a doctrine the test of its truth. No one can have read the decrees of the Councils of the Church without having been struck by the persistency with which the Latin translation substitutes "Catholic faith" for the words "Orthodox faith," almost universally found in the original Greek. Very different are the ideas which the phrases suggest. The Fathers present at these Councils were anxious that what they believed should be true: the determination of the Latin race was that what they believed others should believe too. I have, however, found the phrase in the Greek text with reference to the Creed of Constantinople, and so far there is a certain fitness in it. A Creed should be the expression of the belief of the universal Church, and should admit into it no doctrine which has not been formally ruled and accepted by the whole Church. It is remarkable, however, that in that wonderfully able summary of the views of St. Augustine, miscalled the Creed of St. Athanasius, the phrase is applied to a Creed not accepted by the Eastern Church, and containing in it the statement of doctrines, some of which that Church ignores, or even denies. Virtually, therefore, we unchurch the Greek and Oriental Communions, in affirming that the Catholic faith is that which they neither profess nor believe. The phrase, therefore, involves every conscientious man in a grave difficulty, nor is it easy to see how it can be reconciled with the article in the Apostles' Creed, in which we profess our belief in a Catholic Church, of which the Greek and Oriental Communions are certainly members.

† Newman's 'Apology,' pp. 198, 199, 259, 323, 382, 383, 389.

will of the Pope, with no synodic action of the Church, and against the advice of many able prelates. I do not set much store upon Vincent of Lerins' criterion, because I believe that many things may be true which nevertheless want one or other of the three requirements: but this dogma, and much besides held at Rome, is utterly destitute of every one of the three. It fails alike in respect of antiquity, of universality, and of consent.

Rome then, at Trent, took up a new position. She definitely there affirmed certain doctrines, which doctrines are contrary to Holy Scripture, unknown to the primitive Church, and distinctly modern: doctrines of which the origin and growth can be plainly traced in the history of the Church. She has not kept the faith committed to her charge, nor proved herself a trustworthy pillar and firm pedestal of Christian doctrine. And in nothing is this change in her position more apparent than in her teaching as regards the priesthood. It is absolutely novel, and unknown to the Fathers of the Church: not indeed destitute of some little show of support in passages of Scripture* literally misunderstood, but entirely contrary to the sense given them in the first thousand years of the Church's history.

No doubt there had been a gradual preparation for the modern Roman theory, both in the mistranslations of the Vulgate, and in the superstitions, which in the ages of ignorance had taken possession of the minds of both priest and people. It was left to the Council of Trent to give synodical assent and authority to these novelties.

---

* I do not think that the Church of Rome has ever decreed any doctrine without some slight show of scriptural authority. No more interesting work probably could be written than one which would trace how the mistranslations of the Vulgate gradually led on to the doctrinal errors finally authorised at the Council of Trent. It is only fair to add that she has a miserable instrument in the Latin language, so singularly unfit for the exact representation of any religious or philosophic idea. But the true sense of Holy Scripture is not what a translation of it may please to say, but what it means in the original language; and for attaining to this we need every possible help, and especially the evidence of those who lived nearest to apostolic times. But in view of the corruption of doctrine which has manifestly been the result of the mistranslations of the Vulgate, I cannot but regret that acknowledged mistranslations in our authorised version, infinitely superior as it is to the Vulgate, should still be set before the people as the true word of God. The time probably has not arrived for a new translation, but at least the more obvious errors might be corrected by authority in the margin, and the clergy authorised to read them in the public services of the church. At present many of the marginal notes, especially in the Old Testament, are even less correct than the text.

The position which the Church of Rome now holds is this, that the power of the priesthood consists in two particulars, the first, that it can reproduce and offer the sacrifice of Christ; the second, that it can remit sins. Armed with these two powers the clergy are interpreters and go-betweens, and mediators between God and man.*

Rightly the Church of Rome holds that everything centres in the sacrifice of Christ. It is the death of Christ which alone gives force and reality to the whole Christian scheme. But her technical views upon it are of recent origin, as is well known to every one moderately acquainted with the history of doctrine: and writers of real logical ability defend her, not on the ground that she still holds "the faith once for all delivered to the saints," but upon a supposed right of developing doctrine, and of decreeing new tenets upon the theory of the presence indefectibly within her of the Holy Ghost. I need not point out the cool assumption of Romanist writers in taking it for granted that the Romish Church is identical with, and equivalent to, the whole Church of Christ: I merely wish to point out that she took up at Trent a new position, in which she does not indeed deny that Christ's sacrifice was once for all offered—ἐφάπαξ, εἰς τὸ διηνεκές (Heb. x. 10, 14)—but asserts, nevertheless, that that same sacrifice is daily reproduced in the sacrifice of the Mass.† It is not a new sacrifice, but *perpetuum sacrificium*, the same one sacrifice continually offered over and over again, and in which that very body of Christ which was born of the Virgin, and sits at the right hand of the Father in heaven, is perpetually immolated. So entirely is it the same as the sacrifice upon the cross, that the Church of Rome even denies that it is a sacrament. For a sacrament is the sign of something else, but this is no sign, but the reality. When reserved in the pyx, or in the act of being carried to the sick, it is a sacrament: but when taken and received, it is no mere sacrament, and therefore

---

* "Potestas tum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri conficiendi et offerendi, tum peccata remittendi sacerdotibus collata est," (Cat. Concil. Trid., ii. vii. 2: cf. also Q.Q. 7 and 24). "Sacerdotes tanquam Dei interpretes et internuncii quidam sunt. Interpres ac Mediator Dei et hominum constituitur sacerdos." —*Id.*, Q.Q. 2, 24.

† "Nobis visibile sacrificium reliquit Salvator, quo cruentum illud semel in cruce paulo post immolandum instauraretur" (Cat. ii. iv. 68). It. ib. "perpetuum sacrificium."

meritorious only; but the very sacrifice itself, and therefore has the power of making satisfaction for sins.*

But if thus there be a very sacrifice, so must there be a very priest, not in a sacramental, or metaphorical, or spiritual sense; but in a sense for which we have no word in English; in the sense of an immolator or sacrificing priest. The word priest is derived from presbyter by the elision of the middle syllable. We still speak of Prester, that is Presbyter John; and in French the name is still prestre or prêtre. In the fifth century the African Church forbad the use of the Greek word which signifies a sacrificing-priest.† But this does not suit the modern theory of Rome. She asserts that the mass is a literal sacrifice, and therefore the celebrant is not presbyter but sacerdos.

If the Lord's supper be a sacrament, "an effectual sign, that is, of grace," the celebrant would be a priest only sacramentally, in a spiritual sense; and Christ would be present sacramentally also, by the sign, in a real but spiritual way.‡ And this is the belief of our Church, that "the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper." Taken the more truly and really because sacramentally. For the corporeal and carnal eating belongs to the body only; and the wicked equally with the faithful can handle and receive a material and objective presence. But the soul is strengthened and refreshed by Christ's sacramental presence, because being spiritual it can reach to the soul. Rome degrades and vulgarizes everything she touches by making it objective; and I cannot conceive of any more intense degradation of the mystery of Christ's presence, than by making it subject to the perception of the senses. Sometimes

* "Sacra eucharistia, dum in pyxide continetur vel ad ægrotum defertur sacramenti, non sacrificii, rationem habet. Deinde etiam, ut sacramentum est, iis qui divinam hostiam sumant, meriti causam affert . . . .; ut autem sacrificium est, non merendi solum, sed satisfaciendi quoque efficientiam continet." (ib., ii. iv. 69.) So true are the words of our Church that the Romish doctrine "overthroweth the nature of a sacrament."—*Art.* xxviii.

† The African Church, in Canon xxxix., as contained in its letter to Pope Cœlestine, A.C. 424, forbids the use of the term sacrificing-priest. The primate, it says, no man may call ἔξαρχον τῶν ἱερέων, ἢ ἄκρον ἱερέα, ἢ τοιοῦτον τροπόν τί ποτε· ἀλλὰ μόνον ἐπίσκοπον τῆς πρώτης καθέδρας.

‡ The Fathers constantly call the bread and wine the types or figures of Christ's body and blood: sometimes also the antitypes, τύποι, or ἀντίτυπα, *e.g.* Cyril of Jerusalem, on the Mysteries, iv. 3, v. 20. So also Augustine, contra Adim. c. 12 (vol. vi. 78), "Our Lord doubted not to affirm This is my body, when He gave a sign of His body."

Rome feels this; and thus she not only affirms that it is an invisible presence, but that it is a mystery "ab oculorum sensu remotissimum." (Cat. ii. iv. 23.) Would that she had thus always spoken, and thereby saved the Church from so dishonouring our Lord's presence. But with our knowledge of what has actually happened, how full of meaning, how prophetic do our Lord's last words become, wherein He warned His disciples that it was profitable for them that He should go away, because then only would the Comforter come, and so He would be present, not corporeally, but by the Spirit, when thus an institution of which He foretold that it would be spiritual (John vi. 63) has been turned into a carnal eating.

But this doctrine lies at the very root of the present views of the Church of Rome respecting the priesthood. It is a doctrine which has grown out of that dramatizing of the events of our Lord's life, which while it may act as a temporary spur to excitement, really degrades religious ideas by removing them from the realm of thought to that of sense. In Romanist countries this appeal to the senses meets one everywhere: nothing so sacred but it is set out with mimic scenic effects; the mother of our Lord becomes a dressed out doll, at Christmas there are cradles and bambinos, in Passion Week an acting of our Lord's death and burial. No doubt these sensuous representations often do powerfully affect the feelings, but there can be as little doubt that they painfully degrade mysteries too sublime and holy for this coarse and materialistic handling.

My point however now is not to show the miserable results which follow upon this materializing of our Lord's most real but spiritual presence; I am only concerned with its effect upon the Romish theory of the priesthood. It has led to an entirely new view, namely, that priests are invested with certain magical powers. By the use of our Lord's words of institution they can cause God to be corporeally and locally present in the fulness of that human nature which He assumed for our salvation. Their human hands break in pieces the very body of God, and pour out His blood. It is not the last supper which they celebrate, at which Christ being present in the body, gave not His body, but bread and wine as the signs or sacraments of His body; it is not this, but Calvary; the very crucifixion, with all its dread realities, which the Romish priest is supposed to reproduce and re-enact.

He works as often as he chooses a dread miracle, at which the sun ought once again to shroud itself in darkness and the earth to quake. And this miracle he works not by any intrinsic fitness for his office; not by any moral quality, or intellectual gift, or spiritual endowment, but by something absolutely external to himself. (Cat. ii. iv. 66.) The one sole qualification is his ordination. The bishop by the laying on of his hands confers this tremendous power. Such a power could come only from Christ himself, and so the Church of Rome holds that Christ gave it to the Apostles, and that they have handed it down in direct succession to the bishops in the present day. And thus in the Church of Rome the Apostolic Succession is a mighty reality as well as an absolute necessity. It gives the priest the power of offering the sacrifice of the cross, not in a sacramental or mystical or spiritual sense, but literally and corporeally. Well may the Church of Rome say, "omnia ab ordinis sacramento pendere." (Cat. ii. vii. 1.) But this claim has another side. Unless Christ bestowed the gift, unless the Apostles handed it on, it is not possessed. Did Christ bestow it? Did the Apostles confer it upon others? Did Barnabas, did even Paul possess it, ordained not by Apostles, but by certain prophets and laymen, teachers at Antioch? And since the time of the Apostles, if in the multitudinous accidents which during eighteen centuries have befallen, there be any broken link anywhere in the chain, the theurgic power is gone. It is no rational service (Rom. xii. 1); its powers are not spiritual or moral, and therefore there can be no appeal to God's general mercies, whereby canonists have held that compensation may be made for any error in the outward form of Christian rites. Nor again, is this reproduction of Christ's death essential to the forgiveness of sins. The teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews is express upon this point, that the merits of Christ's sacrifice offered once for all are a sufficient satisfaction for the sins of all mankind. This great miracle is performed not only without any moral necessity, but without serving for any spiritual end.

Taking into account not merely the difficulties of maintaining the succession unbroken, but also the numberless other impediments in the way of a valid performance of the mass, no Romanist can be sure when once in the year (Cat. ii. iv. 57) he is grudgingly admitted to half the sacrament—to partaking

of the bread only—that it is to him that objective reality which his Church teaches him to expect.

But the Church of Rome claims for her priesthood a second divine power, that of forgiving sins. Sins committed before baptism are entirely washed away in that sacrament (Cat. i. xi. 2), but inasmuch as the infirmity of our nature still remains even in the baptized, Christ has endowed His Church with the power of remitting post-baptismal sins in another way. (*ib.*) But the authorized teaching of the Church of Rome upon this power is something very different from what we find in popular manuals. No one can forgive sins of his own authority but God (*ib.* 6); priests and bishops absolve only by a delegated authority, and their absolution is valid only if they use the power entrusted to them "rite et secundum leges a Christo Domino præscriptas." (*ib.* 1.) Even so they exercise this power only through the sacraments—"per sacramenta solum peccata remitti possunt" (*ib.* 4): and priests and sacraments are but instruments, whereby Christ the author and giver of salvation works in us the remission of sins and justification. (*ib.*)

All this is widely different from that wild teaching, which the Church of Rome permits her clergy to use in popular manuals. In them we find the priest boldly seating himself upon Christ's throne of judgment, and acknowledging no limits to his powers, and no laws prescribed for his guidance. The decrees of the Council of Trent are indeed often less moderate than the teaching of the catechism, but in both the power of absolution is still a delegated authority, subject to revision in a higher court above —"absolutio sacerdotis alieni beneficii est dispensatio .... ad instar actus judicialis." (Conc. Trid. Sess. xiv. c. 6.)

Great confusion, indeed, exists upon the subject, owing to the gradual obliteration of the distinction between the censures of the Church, which her officers can remit; and the punishment of sins here and hereafter, the remission of which through the merits of the Saviour's blood the Church is authorised to declare to penitents, but from which God alone can really absolve. The confusion is plain to any one who has studied the history of the penitential discipline of the Church, and it is plain too that it is only in comparatively recent times that the confusion has been made. Thomas Aquinas still held that the essence of absolution lay in the hearty repentance of the sinner. Peter Lombard held

in a hesitating way that confession must be made to a priest; but he taught unhesitatingly that the priest's absolution was declaratory only. In the thirteenth century the Lateran Council (A.D. 1215) first decreed that confession to a priest was necessary for the remission of mortal sins, and later in the century the indicative form of absolution — *I absolve thee* — was introduced. Aquinas, born ten years after the Lateran Council, declares in one of his opuscula that this formula was not then thirty years old, and William of Paris and Cardinal Hugo both protested against it as a novelty. Up to that time the form had been precative only, like that still used in our Communion service; and in the Visitation of the Sick the absolution, which for thirteen centuries had sufficed for the comfort of dying penitents, was that noble form of words which, now turned into a prayer, follows upon the present comparatively modern absolution. In case of a revision of our services, we should be indeed gainers by having this ancient absolution restored to its place, and the thirteenth-century novelty,—a mere interpolation in the Sarum Manual, and which Dr. Newman in his 'Apologia,' p. 171 note, implies to be contrary to the word of God,—abandoned. Any how, the certain fact that the indicative mood was never used in absolution till a long way on in the thirteenth century, and that in primitive times there was positively no absolution, but a benediction only, is proof enough that the supposed power of the priesthood to forgive sins in right of the keys is a modern invention.

Of the power of the keys the Fathers give two several explanations. By some it is regarded as a moral power. The Church forgives sins by preaching the merits of Christ's sacrifice. Thus Tertullian holds that the keys were given personally to St. Peter, and appeals to the leading part taken by that Apostle in first preaching repentance and faith as his proof. By his means the sins of those multitudes were forgiven, who were brought by his preaching unto Christ. Augustine holds that the keys were not given to Peter personally, but to the whole Church, and in explaining their power he refers to passages like Matt. xviii. 15-18, and affirms that men bind or loose sins when they use all moral means to bring others unto repentance. He expounds in a similar way John xi. 44. When the voice of God reaches a sinner, and wakens him to a new life, he comes forth from the

charnel house of his wickedness still bound hand and foot by the force of inveterate habit. Christ does not himself loose him, but bids the bystanders do so. They—the whole Church, laity and clergy, men and women—loose him by kindness, by sympathy, by exhortation. Of priestly absolution not a trace can be found in the voluminous writings of this great Father, even in places where we might certainly expect to find them, as where he speaks of men troubled in conscience going to consult their clergy, whether or not they ought to make open confession of their sins before the congregation.

Of the other exposition we may take St. Chrysostom as our example. No man speaks more eloquently of the efficacy of a true repentance, nor does he know anything of confession of sins except to God only. But he does claim for priests the power of remitting sins. On this account his name is put foremost in every treatise on the subject. I do not find in these treatises that it has been thought necessary to quote also his explanation of the manner in which priests remit sins, though it occurs in the same part of the same treatise. They remit sins instrumentally only by administering the sacraments! "For if no one," he says, "can enter the kingdom of heaven, except he be regenerate by water and the Spirit; and if he who does not eat the flesh of the Lord, and drink His blood, is excluded from eternal life; and if all these things be accomplished only by the holy hands of the priest, how will any one be able without them to escape the fire of Gehenna, or to obtain the crowns which are in store?" ('De Sac.' iii. 5.—*Cowper.*)

Chrysostom thus knew of only two sacraments generally necessary to salvation, and supposing that they could be administered only by priests, he used this supposition in a rhetorical way for the purpose of magnifying the priest's office. Really, as we have seen, the Church has overruled his view. One of these sacraments may be administered by laymen; and thus, as far as St. Chrysostom's argument goes, the clergy possess and exercise the power of forgiving sins to the same extent, and in the same manner as that in which it is possessed and exercised by a layman in baptising a sick child.

But whether we follow the view of Tertullian or of Chrysostom, in either case the teaching of the primitive Church virtually is, that in giving His Apostles the power of the keys Christ really

committed to them the ministry of His holy Word, by means of which sins are truly forgiven. As the key is in the East the symbol of authority, He also invested the Apostles with the power of government, and accordingly the government of the Church still rests with its Bishops. But finally the teaching of the Apostles is alone authoritative, because Christ gave them a special and personal gift. They were the last inspired teachers; the canon of Holy Scripture closed with them, (Eph. ii. 20); lest it should be supposed that additions might be made to their teaching, Christ declared that "the Spirit of truth should guide them into all the truth," (John xvi. 13): not all truth absolutely, as wrongly translated in our version, but *all the truth;* all which the Church will ever require; all of which she is the keeper and firm support. To the authoritative teaching then of the Apostles, as Tertullian ('De Præscript.') in the second century showed, lies the sole appeal. What Apostles have not taught, that may no man, and no Church, require as necessary to salvation. A doctrine not invented till the fourth or fifth, the ninth, or the thirteenth century, needs no refutation. Whatever be the power of the keys, Popes and Bishops cannot bind where Apostles loosed, nor loose where Apostles bound. Nor does the Church of Rome venture to claim such a power, but acknowledges, as we have seen above, that absolution is valid only when given "in accordance with the laws prescribed by Christ the Lord."

Popularly, however, an absolute power of absolving from sin is claimed by the clergy of the Church of Rome, and by their imitators. Moreover the Council of Trent (Sess. xiv. de Pœn. cap. 2) re-affirmed the novel heresy of the Lateran Council, that the so-called sacrament of penance was necessary for the salvation of all who had fallen into sin after baptism. In penance, confession of sins is to be made to the priest, and his "Ego te absolvo" is the very essence of the sacrament. (Cat. ii. v. 41, 14.) Virtually, therefore, the intervention of the priest is necessary* before sins can be forgiven, even though the Church of Rome guards and limits this power much more carefully than might

* An ordinary explanation is that the priest is not necessary wherever there is *contrition:* but that the repentance of man generally stops short at *attrition*, and attrition is sufficient only when confession has been made to a priest and he has granted absolution. Thus, attrition + the priest = contrition — the priest.

be supposed from popular practice, and the plenary indulgences granted by Popes and Bishops upon the most trifling grounds.

These, then, are the two great prerogatives of the priesthood, according to the new basis upon which the Church of Rome placed itself at the Council of Trent. The business of the clergy is no longer to preach the Gospel and win souls for Christ. That office of teaching, which, according to the mind of St. Paul and of the early Fathers, was the great duty of Christ's ministers, no longer concerns them. They need not be examples to their flock, need not be their guides to holiness, their fathers to aid by counsel and advice, their pastors to feed them with heavenly instruction. They have two, and only two, great functions to perform—the one, continually to reproduce the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross for the forgiveness of the sins "not only of him who immolates, and of him who partakes of the sacrifice, but of all the faithful, whether alive or dead," (Cat. ii. iv. 77); the other, "to receive the confessions of all such as sin after baptism, and to pronounce their absolution."

I need not point out how deeply this degrades the clergy in their moral and spiritual aspect. It is true that the Church of Rome does urge holiness upon her priesthood, but she does so simply in respect of the dignity of their office, and the awful functions with which they are charged. But these functions are ritual only, and are as well performed by the most wicked, the most illiterate, the most stupid, and most vicious of those admitted to holy orders, as by St. Francis of Assisi, or St. Vincent de Paul. The protestant expects of his clergyman moral fitness. His office is to teach, and that he does best by example, as in his own person and household he sets the pattern of a godly life. He must himself strive to follow after all that is lovely and of good report, that he may guide his flock unto that sanctification without which no man shall see the Lord. And if we also hold that the unworthiness of the minister hinders not the effect of the sacraments, it is because, as our Church teaches, their efficacy depends upon the faith of those who rightly receive them. (Art. XXVI.) If with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive the Holy Sacraments the benefit of Christ's gift is not barred by any fault, official or personal, on the part of him who ministers them. But in the Romish Church a new power, of modern invention, has been thrust between God and man.

Christ is no longer the one Mediator. His office has ceased, and the priest is Dei interpres, et internuntius et mediator.

The result is that an impassable gulf separates the Romish priest from the layman. The priest is a being possessed of entirely different powers, whom his Church marks off and separates as widely as possible from the rest of mankind. He may not marry, that he may remain a stranger to the domestic affections, the holiest portion of human life. He is disfigured by the tonsure, and by an unsightly dress, and forced to dwell in a state of isolation, having no associates but those of his own order. The utmost is done to tear from him the ordinary feelings of our nature, and in the Society of the Jesuits this purpose is carried out with ruthless severity. No doubt this increases the power of the clergy. Debarred from all natural objects of affection they promote with concentrated energy the interests of their order. But except in rare and extraordinary cases it is ruin to them as men.

Thus isolated from the laity, and removed beyond the range of their sympathies, the Romish priesthood has fallen an easy prey to the centralizing despotism of the papacy. If they are lords over the faith and conscience of other men, they are themselves the victims of a system which has gradually destroyed all free thought and independence of action on their own part. With us the mass of the clergy are beneficed, and their rights are so protected, that discipline rests rather upon their good feeling and consent, than upon any power in the Bishop effectually to enforce it. In case, too, of legal action, the decisions of the courts tend invariably to enlarge, and not to diminish this freedom. On the Continent the case is reversed. If our freedom verges upon lawlessness, with them freedom has ceased to exist. In France the number of benefices is in constant course of diminution, and nine-tenths of the clergy are removable from their posts at the mere will of the Bishop. Every effort, too, is used to make the Bishop himself dependent upon Rome; and the Gallican Church, which once held the foremost place in Christendom, has lost its independent position, ceased to think for itself, and dares no longer utter the views of Bossuet or Fénélon. If any Bishop or Cardinal there or in Italy venture upon an independent course of action, the whole power of Rome is exerted against him, and in our times with uniform success;

while every priest is aware that if he be not the ready agent of his superiors, he will be summarily stripped of his preferment, and means of living.

But though thus individuals may be practically debarred from exercising the functions of their office, the Church of Rome nevertheless holds that holy orders are indelible. At ordination an impress of Christ's eternal priesthood is stamped upon the soul of each priest, by virtue of which he obtains for life the power of offering Christ for quick and dead. In one sense orders must be indelible in every communion; but, on the other hand, discipline requires that every communion should also possess and exercise the power of excluding unworthy ministers from the exercise of their office. But why, in the case of those who have mistaken their profession, and are either unsuited for or unwilling to remain in the service of the Church, the State should interfere and prevent them from devoting themselves to other callings, where they might be useful, is hard to understand. The maintenance of discipline is practically rendered impossible in merciful times like the present, if exclusion from the ministry is virtually a sentence of starvation. The result is that the Church is obliged to retain men who are discontented with their profession, and the State loses men who might perhaps attain to eminence in other pursuits. What is really wanted is, that the State should so far guard the Church as to make it unlawful for men, who having taken holy orders return to lay callings, to hold afterwards any office or preferment in the Church except under such precautions as would render scandals impossible. If a man's own conscience permit him to renounce his calling, so let it be; but it would be intolerable for men to be able to play fast and loose with holy things, according as best served their worldly interests.

The theory, however, of the indelibility of holy orders is comparatively a small matter, and arises out of speculations of the schoolmen respecting Christ's eternal priesthood, and a stamp of it imprinted at ordination upon the soul, too subtle to be discussed here. I pass on to a more important result of the views of the Church of Rome respecting the priesthood, namely, that the power and right of decreeing doctrine rests with the clergy alone.

Starting with the great fact that it is their duty to teach, the

clergy even at a comparatively early age showed great jealousy of the laity taking any part in their councils. And now it seems as if in the Church of Rome, they too are themselves about to be the subjects of a new usurpation. The ultramontanism of the present day, in its eagerness to push to extremes every new position taken up at Trent, and to destroy everything primitive, is fast arriving at the conclusion, that the Pope solely and alone can decree new doctrines. With us all new doctrines are false doctrines. Our appeal is ever made to the Holy Scriptures, and in our exposition of them we give the foremost place to the writings of the "old Fathers." Naturally in all theological discussion the clergy will speak with authority. For they have devoted themselves to the reading of Holy Scripture, and the study of theology, and unless they are false to their ordination vows, their learning, and the gravity of their lives, will have earned for them the right to speak with that weight which knowledge and uprightness give. But in early times there were many checks upon the undue preponderance of the clerical element in settling the faith. For first of all the bishops were chosen by popular election, and leading laymen like Ambrose were even compelled by the popular voice to assume the episcopate. The laity also were allowed to preach (Eus. 'Eccl. Hist.' vi. 19), and the lay school at Alexandria even exercised a leading influence in the formation of Christian doctrine. In œcumenical councils the emperors interfered in a way which would greatly alarm churchmen, if it were attempted now by the Sovereign as Head of the Church. The sensible compromise made at Chalcedon was chiefly due to the wisdom and influence of Marcian, as was the settlement effected at the first council of Constantinople to Theodosius. But even as regards general councils, canonists have ever held that the validity of their decrees is due not to the votes of the bishops assembled in them, but to the subsequent reception of them by the whole Church.

There can indeed be but little doubt that the despotic government of the emperors has inflicted a lasting injury upon the Church in the way of her common acting. So governed are we by precedent that we scarcely permit ourselves to enquire whether the way of olden times was the best way, or whether it was due merely to accidental causes. Certainly the effect of the Roman

despotism was that the emperor crushed the rights of all the rest of the laity by concentrating them in himself. In accordance then with imperial precedents, it has been usual to summon princes to general councils,—not to the absolute exclusion of the rest of the laity, for certain high functionaries, chancellors and jurists, have usually taken part in them,—yet so as virtually to leave all real power in the hands of Monarchs and Bishops. In the decree just issued by the Pope for the assembling of a new general council all mention of sovereigns is omitted as a new step towards the consummation of the Papal autocracy. As usual Holy Scripture corrects the narrow tendencies of later times. The first council held at Jerusalem met upon a broader basis. "All the multitude" was present; the form of the decision was, "It pleased the apostles and elders with the whole Church:" and the letters containing the decree ran in the name of "the apostles and elders and* brethren." (Acts xv.) It is to be hoped that if diocesan synods are revived this point will not be forgotten. The laity form an integral portion of the Church; and whatever power and authority is possessed by the bishops and clergy comes to them from the will of the whole Church, which, as we have seen, even ordained Paul and Barnabas to the Apostolate. On this account the presence and assent of the laity was held to be necessary in the election and appointment of bishops, priests, and deacons, as Cyprian (Ep. iv.) shows at length from Holy Scripture. And so now if synods are to be of any real use, the whole Church must speak in them. There must be a fair representation both of the clergy of every degree, and also of the laity. Common action would then cement the Church together, and the decisions of an assembly where all classes and orders were adequately represented would tend powerfully to abate our present dissensions and bind us together in peace.

But whatever might be the influence of such a synod, the consentient voice of antiquity and of our own Church forbids the bringing in of any new doctrine. The Church must teach what its Master taught, and that only. Before the New Testa-

* One or two MSS. of very great authority omit this *and*, reading "the elders who are brethren." But while we can quite understand its omission in times when the clergy had excluded the laity, we cannot understand how it could have found its way into the vast majority of MSS. unless it had originally been there. There is no difference of reading in the other two places.

ment was collected, when both apocryphal gospels were plentiful, and heretics like Marcion also corrupted the true Gospels, to make them bend to their views, men anxiously asked how they were to know what really was Christ's doctrine. To allay this anxiety Tertullian wrote his treatise 'De Præscriptione Fidei,' and in it he showed that the sole appeal upon doctrine is to the Apostles, but inasmuch as there was as yet no certain record of their teaching, he used as a test the customs and traditions of the Churches which they had founded, and especially those of Rome. We stand now on far surer grounds. The lapse of centuries has indeed made the appeal to the customs of Churches less convincing. Our sole trustworthy knowledge of them is what we obtain from the writings of the primitive Fathers. And this is but scant. No sooner, however, had the Church rest from persecution than she set herself to the task of distinguishing between those books which were canonical and had apostolic authority, and those which had not. As regards the New Testament, so well did the Fathers of the fourth century perform this duty, that in no instance has their verdict been disturbed; and every fresh discovery like that of the Muratorian fragment only confirms their judgment. In the case of the Old Testament the result was different. The Fathers generally had neglected the study of Hebrew, and were therefore incompetent for the task undertaken by them. They were so entirely at the mercy of the Septuagint, that they could not even distinguish between those portions which were translations from the Hebrew, and those which were mere Alexandrian additions to the genuine text. And God wrought no special miracle to compensate for their want of knowledge. To this day we suffer from their breach of duty. The disputes about the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, and the false position given to several of them by the Church of Rome, arise simply from the fact, that the Fathers of the fourth century undertook to give judgment upon the books of the Old Testament without knowing the language in which they were written; and worse than worthless as such a judgment must be Rome nevertheless chooses to abide by it. In the case of the books of the New Testament they had competent knowledge, and being great and wise men, they decided wisely and well.

There is then now no dispute as to what was the teaching of

110879

the Apostles, and the appeal so difficult in Tertullian's days is easy to us. This appeal our Church confidently makes. While the clergy of every communion are bound indeed to abide by the articles and formularies of their Church (for otherwise common honesty forbids them from enrolling themselves among, or continuing to be her ministers), yet they ought to do so only upon the conviction that those articles and formularies are in accordance generally with the Word of God. And thus then in her ordination service our Church makes no appeal to the decrees of councils, or to Catholic usage, though as we learn from the homilies she greatly respects both, but only to the teaching of the Apostles. Of every candidate for priests' orders she demands, "Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ? And are you determined out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge: and to teach nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?" This then is her standard, and any one of her ministers who sets up any other test or criterion of doctrine violates the solemn promise which he gave, when he answered, "I am so persuaded, and have so determined by God's grace."

But in interpreting the Scripture we claim for the clergy no higher authority than that to which their learning and habits of study entitle them. God gives His blessing to those who make use rightly of the means, just as we have seen that He blessed the conscientious labours of the Fathers of the fourth century, where they had taken pains to acquire competent knowledge, but did not bless them where they had not taken pains. The Church of Rome claims either for the clergy in general, or for the Pope in particular, the exclusive right of expounding doctrine, endeavouring to give as usual an objective reality to a subjective truth. For without the assistance and presence of the Holy Spirit no man can attain to a correct understanding of the true meaning of the revealed word. But the Church of Rome will not permit that Holy Spirit to move as He listeth, but codifies His operations, and makes them dependent upon external conditions. No doubt she has some excuse for this. The wild excesses into which many heretics ran in the applica-

tion of Scripture, while refusing to make their interpretations subject to any rule or criterion whatsoever, is a sort of justification even for the obstinacy wherewith she adheres, for instance, to the judgment upon the Apocrypha of men who had every other fitness for the task of judging except sufficient knowledge. Really God's Holy Spirit aids men according to their knowledge, their ability, their good sense, and above all their moral fitness. But the most pious man without learning, judgment, and experience must be content with attaining to but a moderate degree of truth, though doubtless that will conduce more to his growth in grace, than the greatest knowledge in one whose heart has not been reached by the truths he holds. Still the man who can construe neither the Greek of the New Testament, nor the Hebrew of the Old, can never be fit to be a teacher of others, except in a very humble way. For no man is justified in expecting miraculous aid to compensate for the absence of that knowledge which God has given him the faculties to acquire for himself.

But still less can the knowledge necessary for rightly interpreting Scripture be imparted by the laying on of hands. An ignorant priest is a disgrace to his office, and to suppose that the office which he degrades will act as a compensation for the ignorance wherewith he degrades it, is an absurdity. But we may go still farther. Absolutely there is no such thing as infallibility on earth, and no means provided in the Church for any one whatsoever attaining to perfect knowledge. St. Paul, inspired Apostle though he was, did not possess it (1 Cor. xiii. 12), but looked forward to it as part of the happiness of a final state yet to be revealed. In this our waiting stage, not certainty but faith is our assurance, and the dissatisfaction which some minds feel at this absence of certainty belongs to that state of feeling which made the Manichees affirm, that the Creator was a finite and imperfect being, because He had not made the world perfectly good.

It is indeed the duty of the clergy to teach, and to discharge this duty conscientiously they must earnestly study both God's Holy Word and whatever may help to the knowledge of the same. As honest men, too, they are bound to teach in accordance with the articles and formularies of the Church, having first satisfied their minds that they are sufficiently in accordance

with the Bible for them to be able to give them a general but hearty acceptance. If they cannot do this they ought to cease teaching, and if their convictions are definite enough, they ought to join that communion with whose authorised teaching they agree. If their convictions are unsettled, let them abide where they are, and do their best by prayer, and the reading of the Scriptures, and the use of every possible means of instruction, to arrive at more settled views of God's truth; but let them not teach. If, however, any feel the hearty conviction that our Church combines, more thoroughly than any other, evangelical truth with apostolical order, and that they therefore can conscientiously hold the office of presbyter within her pale, then the duty is incumbent upon them of making themselves as fit as possible for their high office. When first admitted to holy orders much knowledge cannot possibly have been acquired by them, and if they make no effort to add to their scanty stock; if their reading be that only of serials, and newspapers, and the trash of a lending library; if, in short, regular study form no part of their daily preparation, and God's revealed Word be a sealed book to them except so far as they can approach it by the help of an interpreter in the shape of a translation, however excellent that translation be, they will grow daily more unfit for the discharge of the most important of their duties, and they and their people alike will be the prey of the current fallacies and absurdities of the hour.

By the right use however of the means added to real and fervent piety, and the aid of God's Holy Spirit in answer to prayer, they will become fit to teach, and the laity will gladly be taught by those qualified for the office. But truth is equally open to the layman. It is not an attribute attached to an office, or given by any outward rite. Ever it is the reward of loving and earnest search. A Papal brief, or encyclical, can give no assurance that its propositions are true, and if they are arrived at by the same sort of process as that which the fanatic uses, they will be just as fanatical and untrue.

I have thus then endeavoured to discuss the three main particulars in which the theory of the Romish Church, as re-constituted at the Council of Trent, differs from that primitive view which we retain unchanged. No doubt the whole theory

of the Church is different in the two Communions. We regard it as "a congregation of faithful men," consisting externally of "all who profess and call themselves Christians," and the clergy exist not for their own good, but that they may minister to the good of the whole believing community. The edification of the layman is in our view the justification of the existence of a separate ministry. We defend that separation on moral grounds, upon the inconsistency of lay and spiritual duties, upon the care and study requisite for the proper discharge of the duties of a teacher, upon the necessity of the clergy setting a high religious standard, and the consequent danger of entangling them in worldly pursuits. And by their spiritual duties we understand "the ministration of the word and sacraments," or, in other words, the preaching of the Gospel, the pastoral oversight of his parishioners, and the celebration of public service and all the rites and ceremonies of the Church. To this must be added the missionary aspect of a clergyman's life, whereby he is ever seeking to win fresh souls for Christ, and extend the bounds of his Master's kingdom. In the view of Rome the Church is a divine institution in which the clergy hold an exclusive place and separate privileges, not for the good of others, but by absolute right. Its lay members must yield their judgments, their wills, and their consciences to certain men, not because they are morally fit to guide them, but because they have been admitted by an external rite to a particular office. They must believe what the priest teaches them, even though they cannot find proof of it in the Scriptures: they must confess their sins unto him, or they cannot be forgiven; and though they may habitually neglect the Holy Communion —for they are required to partake of it but once a year—yet all their prayers, and praise, and adoration, are acceptable only because of that incessant reproduction of Christ's sacrifice which the priest alone can effect for them.

Really this view degrades the priesthood: and so does every aspect of it which exalts its ministerial at the expense of its moral functions. We believe that the work of Christ was not imperfect, and that what is still necessary is that each one should apprehend Christ by that living faith, which will compel him to labour earnestly to make his election sure by yielding himself to the sanctifying influences of the Holy Ghost. With us the

priesthood of the heart is not merely acknowledged in words as by the Church of Rome, but is held as a central truth, ensuring to each penitent soul the right of access to the Saviour without the intervention of any earthly mediator. But men still require to be brought near unto Christ, and it is the duty of the clergy to teach them what Christ has done for them, to urge them to accept Him as their Redeemer, and to press home to their consciences every motive that can move them to repentance, to faith, and to prayer. But their duties do not end here. For there is also the congregation of the faithful, and they are its ministers, its servants, to celebrate the rites of its public worship, and in private to labour earnestly that they may all attain to the fulness of the stature of Christ. It may indeed be gratifying to human vanity to be vested in rich attire, and to suppose oneself marked off from the mass of mankind for the purpose of performing an act indispensable for their salvation, but the real honour of the priesthood lies in its pastoral duties, and these are best performed in the spirit of love, with all lowliness, and meekness, and long-suffering. (Eph. iv. 2.) It is these spiritual qualifications which give value to the priest's external call to the ministry. If he possess no moral fitness for his office, however valid may be his ordination, he is none of Christ's workmen, nor will his work endure.

Lastly, let each one read the account given by St. Paul (Eph. iv. 11-16) of the work of the ministry from the Apostles downwards, and mark how it all centres in teaching: let him read also the contrast drawn by that same Apostle (2 Cor. iii. 6, *sqq.*) between the ministry of the letter which killeth, and that of the New Testament, which, by being spiritual, giveth life: let him search too everywhere into the words of the Apostles, and see if he can find any justification for a sacrificing priesthood, for the confessional, for priestly absolution, or for any exclusive right of the clergy to define what is truth. A few passages have, I know, been distorted to meanings which do not belong to them, but not one of these passages was so understood in primitive, or even till a late period in mediæval times. The apostolic model is that of pastors and teachers, whose duty is to "preach the word, be instant in season, out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine." Upon this model the ministry of our Church is formed. Her bishops,

representing the unity of Christ's glorious body, are her chief teachers, and have besides the less honourable though equally necessary duty of being her chief rulers, to maintain such godly discipline as may tend to the general edification: while her presbyters share with them the teacher's office and the pasterate of souls. And with the teacher's office is essentially united the administration of the Holy Sacraments, as the effectual signs of grace, given by Christ to bind believers more closely to Himself. For more than this no warrant can be found, either in Holy Scripture or in the teaching of the Primitive Church.

R. Payne Smith.

ESSAY IV.

NATIONAL EDUCATION.

By ALEXANDER R. GRANT, M.A.,

Rector of Hitcham, Suffolk, late H.M. Inspector of Schools.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY IV.

Change of public opinion on the subject.

Former opposition to the education of the lower classes.

Recent demands for general education supported by rates.

Causes of the change—

1. The extension of the suffrage.
2. Opinions as to the decline of English manufacturing superiority, derived from the Paris Exhibition.

Exertions of the clergy in promoting education.

Motive of those exertions.

Probable effect of introducing education rates.

Secular education—its evils.

The present demand for it probably emanates from a small minority.

Nevertheless it should be met by extending the existing system as far as possible.

More facilities should be given to poor parishes—

1. By relaxing the conditions as to certificated teachers.
2. By more liberal building grants.

The Conscience Clause.

Conclusion.

NATIONAL EDUCATION.

THE word Education has lately received a new meaning—namely, the process by which a party is led to opinions the opposite of those which it held before. There is no question on which all parties have been more subjected to this process, than that of education itself. Thirty years ago, the idea that the children of the labouring poor ought to be educated, was regarded as an amiable kind of fanaticism, though withal a troublesome one, inasmuch as it led to vexatious demands of money for the support of schools. It was allowed, indeed, to be a good thing for the poor to learn to read their Bibles, with the view of teaching them their duty to their betters, and reducing the expenses of prisons and policemen,—though this latter result was considered by no means certain;—but, as to teaching anything beyond the merest rudiments, the giving anything of mental training—in a word, anything which could even by courtesy be called education—the prevailing opinion was that it was quite uncalled for, and probably dangerous.

The system of public aid to education which began about the period referred to, did not represent any considerable change of opinion on the subject. It was introduced by a small minority, and was some time in operation before it met with much sympathy. Even when it had greatly extended itself, and schools under its influence were springing up on all sides, it was very far from having overcome the prejudices against it. Its advance was regarded with jealousy and fear. It was assailed with a good deal of angry but feeble ridicule. The current literature of periodicals and tracts, as well as novels, contained dull stories of the pedantry and conceit of certificated teachers, and of the absurd questions put by Inspectors. A more serious cause of complaint and alarm was the expense which, it was predicted, would soon overwhelm the country. As late as 1861, the dread of over-education prevailed, and the 'Revised Code' of that

year was welcomed with a chorus of approval, not so much on account of the improvements it introduced as of the cutting down which it effected both of teaching and expenditure. People breathed more freely when they found that henceforth the country was only to pay for proved results in the time-honoured and safe three R's. As to training the mind—as to turning the said acquirements to account by collateral knowledge, and throwing open the wealth of science and literature to the labourer—this was mere Quixotism. What did a ploughman want with all that? And besides, was it not the preserve of the privileged classes? Should the ploughman be encouraged to poach upon it? Were not "geography and the use of the globes," accomplishments? and, as such, like French and music, the legitimate appendages of genteel seminaries? What would the world come to, if we were to make such things common? Would not the ranks of society be reversed? Would it any more be possible to find ploughmen, or housemaids, or cooks? Had not much mischief already ensued to domestic service, from the mania for teaching, so that girls in service had taken to wasting their employers' time in reading—in some desperate cases, it is to be feared, their employers' books—and that it had become unsafe for ladies to continue the innocent but too-confiding practice, of leaving their letters open to inspection on their drawing-room tables?

Every one has heard this kind of thing repeated *ad nauseam*, within a few years of the present time. But now "nous avons changé tout cela." Now, "education is the birthright of every citizen, long iniquitously withheld." "It is a scandalous blot on our Government not to have placed a school within reach of every child in the country." "The thing must be done immediately." "Neglected places must be sought out. Negligent landlords and farmers must be made to do their duty. An education rate must be levied." The rapidity of these conclusions takes away our breath. Whence has sprung this new-born zeal? Some of us have dim recollections that it is not long since ideas much less advanced were those with which we tried in vain to indoctrinate our friends, and failing of success had to carry them out, as best we could, unassisted by those to whom we had a right to look for assistance. That, I am sure, is the experience of a very large proportion of the clergy. The land-

owner too often regarded the school subscription as an irregular tax on his property, and grumblingly gave as little as he could help. The farmer if he did not refuse altogether, painfully parted with his literal mite, with the conviction that he was paying to convert labourers into fine gentlemen, and to spoil the raw material providentially ordained to furnish agricultural drudges.

This race has now for the most part passed away.

I am very glad of the change, so far as the recognition of the advantages of education is concerned, but I am curious about the process of "Education" which has produced it—how people whom I have been urging onwards all my life, have suddenly got so much beyond me. I feel rather like certain well-sinkers of whom I lately read, who, after a long period of unsuccessful labour, suddenly tapped a spring, and had to retire precipitately before the rising water, for fear of being drowned. It seems to me that the causes of the change in public opinion are chiefly two—first, the extension of the suffrage, the motive avowed by Mr. Lowe, that we may mitigate in some degree the rule of our future masters; secondly, the recent discovery of our inferiority to the principal continental nations in many departments of art and manufacture, where the influence of education is supposed to tell against us.

As to the former motive, it is hardly a statesmanlike view that the classes whose newly acquired power needed education to direct it, had no power before which ignorance might render dangerous. But there is to my mind a much graver mistake involved in this way of regarding the question, that is, the way of treating education with reference to external circumstances, and not to its intrinsic worth. This is a very prevalent error, indeed it runs through a large proportion of what is written and said on the subject. Education is treated as belonging to a certain social position, or as a means of obtaining money, or a perquisite of wealth, or as something valuable for its influence in society. It is generally supposed necessarily to accompany a good coat, and when divorced from that accessory, to be either wronged, or out of its proper place. If an educated man is seen in shabby attire, people conclude that he has fallen from a better position, and bestow on him corresponding pity. If, on the other hand, they find that he was never anything else than

a poor man, they are very apt to abuse him for presumption. Hence arises a very wide-spread opinion that educating the lower classes has a tendency to lift them out of their proper place, and so to throw society into confusion. And, almost universally, education is appraised by the money that it will gain, or the rank that it will win. No doubt it has advantages which are capable of being so estimated. Instruction in a given science or accomplishment, will yield a return, which may be calculated, for the money invested in it. The world will pay handsomely those who minister to its interest or pleasures. But is this all the good of education? Will a man gain nothing by it but what is external?—money in his pocket?—greetings in the markets, and the highest rooms at feasts? Surely it is but repeating a truism to say that the great benefit is bestowed on the man himself, enlarging his mental view, strengthening his mental powers, opening to him new sources of healthy pleasure, putting into his hand the key of a treasure-house of boundless wealth, which he can enjoy to the full without satiety, and of which no outward circumstances can rob him. And, when to this you add the elevation of learning to know God, and to hold communion with Him, and the treasures in Heaven, which transcend those of the intellect as much as these do the treasures of earth, you have means of enriching and ennobling with which no earthly power can compete. The poorest man may have all this without wronging any one. His elevation may be attained without putting any one else down. He may be made rich without making any one else poor.

But let us turn to the other cause suggested for the present sudden impulse towards national education—viz., the advantages derived by other nations from the superior education of the class of workmen. One of the results of the Paris Exhibition last year, was the unpleasant discovery that England has very much lost ground as compared with the rest of the world, in industrial reputation. This has been very generally attributed to the inferiority of the English workman in education—technical education in the first instance—but also in primary education, as a necessary basis for technical education to rest upon.

This view is ably set forth in an article by Mr. Scott Russell in 'Macmillan's Magazine' for April, with extracts from the

reports of some of the most eminent men who acted as jurors at the Exhibition, and also of some of the artisans who were sent over to study their own departments of trade, as there exhibited. All these reports speak more or less strongly of the want of technical instruction in this country and the importance of supplying it. Several go on to complain, besides, of the inferiority of our primary education. Professor Tyndall says generally, "I have long entertained the opinion that, in virtue of the better education provided by continental nations, England must one day, and that no distant one, find herself outstripped by those nations, both in the arts of peace and war." Mr. Mallet says he has been long convinced that, "unless checked by a vast improvement in our own educational system, general and technical, the pre-eminence of England must decline." Mr. Mundella compares England and Saxony, much to the advantage of the latter. "In Saxony," he says, "our manager, during seven years, has never met with a workman who cannot read and write, not merely in the imperfect manner in which the majority of English artisans are said to read and write, but with a freedom and familiarity that enables them to enjoy reading, and to conduct their correspondence in a creditable and often superior style." And again, "I am of opinion that the English workman is gradually losing the race, through the superior intelligence which foreign Governments are gradually developing in their artisans. The education of Germany is the result of a national organisation, which compels every parent to send his children to school, and afterwards affords the opportunity of acquiring such technical knowledge as may be useful in the department of industry to which they are destined."

Of artisans, the lacemakers of Nottingham, after stating their opinion of the decided superiority of the French in their trade, express the hope "that the time is not far distant when some national system of compulsory education will be brought into existence, to lessen the ignorance amongst us and place our country on an equality of intelligence with other nations."

The evidence of eighty-eight skilled workmen who have made reports, is comprehensively stated by Mr. Scott Russell to record their profound conviction, "1st. Of the pressing peril of the nation in regard to manufacturing pre-eminence; 2nd. Of the culpability of the educated classes and of the Executive Government

in having neglected the education of the people." On this latter subject the disquisitions of the writers show more zeal than knowledge; but they are important, as probably representing opinions widely spread among their class. The following extract from the Report of Mr. Randall, a china painter, especially deserves attention on this score. It is a gross misrepresentation of the state of things amongst us.—"We have been groping our way," he says, "in ignorant and bigoted security, and quarrelling in which way education should be given, while other nations have been getting before us;" and again, "What we complain of, and what the country raising the taxes to support the present system complains of most, is that, being in the hands of the clergy, and under inspection by men drafted from them, it is used as a proselytising scheme, rather than an engine for fitting children for their future duties in life. They are crammed with catechisms, Jewish pedigrees; with things pertaining to the past, which have no relation whatever to their future modes and pursuits of life . . . ."

The strong motive apparent in all these extracts is the desire to hold our own with foreign nations, and this is a feeling an appeal to which is sure to command success. There appears to me no doubt that something must be done. There will be a demand, which no Government can resist or evade, to make primary education general. What with dread of being ruled by ignorant masses, or surpassed by foreign nations, we shall be obliged to move. It is of the utmost importance in what direction that movement shall be. There is a great tendency to depreciate the existing system, especially by those who are not practically acquainted with it; some of whom, just roused from utter apathy to the importance of the subject, think that everybody else has been asleep like themselves. The cry, then, is for something new; something like what they have in Germany and France. There is a strong opinion, as expressed in the last extract quoted, that the main obstruction hitherto has been the bigotry of the clergy, and that, this being swept away, we shall be able to run a fairer race against our continental neighbours. The falsity of this assertion is only matched by its ingratitude. The bigotry, as it is called, of the clergy, that is, their desire to promote the religious education of their flocks, has been, in truth, the mainspring of the existing system. It is this which

has made them carry on schools through evil report and good report, in spite of difficulties and obstructions, supplying much beyond their due proportion of the cost.* But for them there would not be one-tenth of the Church-schools which now exist, and, if they withdrew their labour and their money, doubtless a large proportion of them would presently collapse. Yet after this we are told that clerical bigotry is the obstacle to progress. What have the complainers been doing themselves all this time? Where is the work they have done for education? Where are the sacrifices they have made? They have allowed the existing system to grow up, mainly by the exertions of the clergy, without helping it, without even ascertaining what has been done; and now they want to take it out of the hands which have made it what it is; not that they may work it themselves—that they have no idea of doing—but that they may have the control of it without any exertion of their own. A truly modest and generous proposition! In claiming their due for the clergy, I have no wish to exaggerate. When I say that they have often had to work without due assistance from the laity, I do not deny that this has been sometimes their own fault; that they have been in some cases too anxious to have everything done in their own way, and have been too jealous of lay interference. But, at the same time, I am fully convinced that the reason the laity did not help was generally that they were indifferent about educa-

* "In rural districts . . . . the landowners do not contribute to the expenses of the schools so liberally as the wealthy classes in mining districts or large towns, so that the burden of supporting the schools falls principally on the parochial clergy, who are very ill able to support it. This is set in a strong light by a letter published in the Appendix to Mr. Fraser's Report, from which it results that 4518*l.* contributed by voluntary subscription towards the support of 168 schools was derived from the following sources:—

		£.	£.	s.	d.	
169	clergymen contributed	1782	or 10	10	0	each
399	landowners „	2127	„ 5	6	0	„
217	occupiers „	200	„ 0	18	6	„
102	householders „	181	„ 1	15	6	„
141	other persons „	228.				

"The rental of the 399 landowners is estimated at 650,000*l.* a year. . . . . It has been repeatedly noticed by the school inspectors, and it is our duty to state that, as a class, the landowners, especially those who are non-resident (though there are many honourable exceptions), do not do their duty in the support of popular education, and that they allow others, who are far less able to afford it, to bear the burden of their neglect. These observations apply chiefly to schools connected with the Church of England, to which denomination almost all the schools in rural districts belong."—*Report of the Commissioners appointed to Inquire into the State of Popular Education in England.* 1861, vol. i. 77, 78.

tion, or hostile to it. They were in a great many instances afraid of over-teaching the working classes, and spoiling them for servants and labourers. And in scarcely any case that I remember was the want of support by the laity due to any proselytism attempted by the clergy. That the clergy in most cases made religious instruction paramount, I am quite willing to allow. If this be bigotry, I plead guilty to it in their name. It is for the sake of religious instruction also that they have incurred labour and expense; but to say that secular instruction has thereby suffered, is simply untrue. The best schools in religious knowledge were generally, in my experience, the best in secular knowledge too. If there was any jealousy about carrying the instruction too far, it came more often from the lay subscriber than from the clerical manager. In fact, it frequently happened that the clergyman, who established a school chiefly with the view of religious teaching, and placed it under Government inspection for the sake of pecuniary assistance, was carried on to become a zealous educationist, and ended by taking as much interest in the intellectual progress of the children as the most ardent secularist could do. The real obstacle to education hitherto has been fear of over-education. And there is some reason to fear whether the cry for education now is not just as selfish as the cry against it was before. Now the object is all to make the lower classes useful. Before, it was thought that education would spoil them for the use of their betters. Now it is found that ignorance spoils them more. I cannot see that the desire to teach them the great truths of the Christian Faith suffers from comparison with these motives, even though that Faith itself should be regarded as it is by the gentleman who describes instruction in it as the "being crammed with catechisms and Jewish pedigrees."

We must not shut our eyes to the fact that the cry is really for secular education. The Liberal party, from which it mainly proceeds, is making a general crusade against Denominationalism. The crusade is really one against all religious instruction. Its object is to wrest the office of teaching out of the hands of the clergy. Is there anything really illiberal in the Denominational system? On the contrary, is it not that under which the largest amount of liberty may be enjoyed? If we ask what has been the result of the national system as established

in Ireland, we shall find that every earnest religious teacher in that country, whether Romanist or Protestant, is anxious to overthrow it; whereas in England the opposite system advanced with strides so rapid, that its expenses threatened to become a serious burden. The Denominational system has, indeed, one fault, that, depending in part on voluntary efforts, it cannot be made universal by the will of the nation, but to oppose it on the score of Liberalism is one of the most monstrous perversions even of that ill-used designation. I am aware that the existing system is favourably spoken of, and the exertions of the clergy fairly acknowledged, by some of the promoters of change, and that the only alterations which they recommend are intended to supplement what has been already done, and to carry education into districts now without it. This it is proposed to do by giving powers in certain cases to establish schools and support them by rates; while of course it must be conceded to existing schools to avail themselves of the same means of support. But this, whatever its intention, is really secular education in disguise; for there is little doubt that rate-supported education must eventually become secular, and that the principle of rates once introduced must gradually, but certainly, destroy the voluntary element. It is an established principle that whatever object is supported by local rates, the rate-payers must have a voice in the expenditure of the money concerned with it, either personally or by representation, either by vote of a parish vestry, or by a Board of elected members. If a school is managed by such a Board, it is clear that there can be no definite teaching of religious doctrine. There must be a compromise among the men of different opinions who are sure to compose such a Board. The result must necessarily be the paring down of the religious teaching till it is worthless, or leaving it out altogether. Probably even the latter would be the preferable alternative. But even schools under their own managers, if claiming assistance from rates, must come under the conditions which the Board chooses to impose; and no one who knows anything of local politics can doubt that the influence of the Local Board would not be always very delicately used; that anything like strong religious views would be objected to by one member or another, and that a gradual process would be carried on of assimilation to the secular type.

But, it may be said, Why should the existing schools not go on as at present? Why should they trouble themselves about rates? For the very sufficient reason that rates will not let them alone. How many people will go on supporting a school by subscription, when they find that they can make others, who will not subscribe, pay their fair share of the expenses? The clergy are taxed to the utmost as it is. They cannot pay any more. What are they to do, when thus left stranded, but throw the school upon the rates, or shut it up? Again, supposing that, contrary to probability, all the supporters in a given parish remain staunch. There are other parishes, probably, in the same union, where there are no schools. Suppose these are compelled by authority to set up schools to be supported by rates. The rates, of course, must come from the whole union. Consequently the parish in question has to pay its quota for the schools of other parishes, in addition to the entire support of its own school. Is such an arrangement likely to last? I conclude, therefore, that the introduction of the principle of rating must, sooner or later, be fatal to the existing system, and consequently deeply, if not fatally, injurious to religious education. The channel of rating once cut, will draw into itself all the fertilizing streams of voluntary contribution, and leave the system they nourish dry. I hope, therefore, that those who deprecate such a result will be on their guard against any measure, permissive or otherwise, for introducing local rates, and not unwittingly consent to it as only introducing desirable modifications into the existing system, and increasing its efficiency.

I have assumed all along that secular education, or education without religion, is a system to be deprecated. I may be accused of inconsistency in this, after insisting on the advantages of the secular as well as the religious part of a complete education. If this really enlarges the mind and gives possession of untold intellectual treasures, why is it not a benefit by itself? Why should we withhold it unless we can give religious instruction as well? If we cannot get every one to receive religious instruction is it not better to give secular instruction than none at all? Would it not be a gain for the State to give secular education to all, and to let the clergy supplement it, as far as they could, by religious instruction?

This would leave religious instruction, it might be argued, just as it is, so that at least no harm would be done.

This appears, on the face of it, a very reasonable proposition. But, in the first place, it is very far from true that religious instruction would remain unaffected by it. As soon as it ceased to be a part of the regular school course there would be a great temptation for the teachers to neglect it. But, even if this were not so, there is this great objection to the plan, that it places education on a false basis. It makes it consist of two separate and independent parts, the intellectual and the religious. It assumes that religion may be taught as an *extra*, or left out at pleasure, and that secular education is complete without it, as it may be said to be complete without music or drawing. But no Christian teacher can be content with such a place for the faith of Christ. He must teach its paramount importance and authority if he teaches it at all. He must teach that, if it is to be received to any purpose, it must pervade the whole life; he must teach it as the guide and leading motive of conduct. It is true that secular instruction opens vast treasures of knowledge, but it is knowledge, be it remembered, of both good and evil. Are we to give the key without furnishing the means of distinguishing between the evil and the good—between wholesome food and deadly poison—especially when we know that human nature is much more inclined to the poison than the food? I do not wish to depreciate secular knowledge. I do not deny that a cultivated mind has many and great advantages over an uncultivated one. I believe that religious education is not only not hindered, but immensely helped, by secular instruction; but I hold that to profess to *educate*, in the full sense of the word, without religion, is to act a falsehood. It is to give a part for the whole, and virtually to assert that it is the whole, though wanting in an element which is essential. Education means the whole training,—not only developing the mental powers and storing the mind with knowledge, but also inculcating principles of action. If we omit this last element, it is something like launching a ship on the ocean with all her sails set, but without a rudder. The more power we impart the greater is the scope for going astray.

It is often urged in favour of mere secular education, that by giving the capacity for intellectual enjoyment you neutralize the

taste for gross sensual pleasure. On this account the opening of museums and picture galleries on Sundays has been often urged as a panacea for the grosser modes of holiday-keeping now in vogue among the lower orders. Undoubtedly it is much better that a man should read or look at pictures than debase himself by drinking. But there is a fatal flaw in the argument founded upon this. There is an assumption which amounts to a *petitio principii*, that intellectual pleasures are necessarily good, and that it is only sensual pleasures that are bad. But the truth is that there are both innocent pleasures of sense and vicious pleasures of the mind. It is not fair to set instructive reading against drinking, and the pleasures of art against those of low debauchery. There are perversions of the intellect more hideous than the most bestial intoxication. There are refinements in vice far worse than mere animal filthiness. The fact is that, with the enlargement of the mind, its capacity for evil is as much extended as its capacity for good. One may well, therefore, hesitate to apply a remedy which may turn out to be worse than the disease. Nor is it mere conjecture that this may be the result. The examples which history supplies of civilization unenlightened by Divine Revelation, even where, as in Greece, art was carried to the highest perfection, show us the most frightful moral evil in the closest contact with the highest intellectual culture. But we have examples much more applicable to our own case. The United States' Government has tried the very plan recommended to us—a National system of secular education, leaving religious instruction to be given by ministers of religion as they best can. What is the result? If we may believe what is said by religious men of all opinions the result has been an alarming increase of infidelity and vice. Sometimes we hear it said that the worst enemy of virtue is ignorance; but both reason and experience tell us that there is a worse,—viz., a combination of irreligious opinions with immoral practice, the intellect perverted, the heart hardened, the eyes of the mind blinded, the affections poisoned, the springs of faith and love destroyed. No doubt it is not often that we have so extreme an example as this. Under favourable circumstances secular education is a great improvement on ignorance, especially now that there is so large an indirect influence of Christian principles—felt even by men who disown the Christian

faith. But these exceptions must not blind us to the truth that the cultivation of the intellect has no directly moral effect, however it may, in some cases, conduce to morality by giving useful occupation and worthy objects of pursuit. Consequently secular education is in itself no safeguard against moral evil, though it may possibly tend to reduce the number of low and coarse offences; while, nevertheless, too probably substituting for them more refined vices and crimes.

I have reason to think that the importance of the religious element in education is acknowledged by a large number of the laity as well as the clergy. I believe the cry for secular education emanates from a very small minority, though one whose energy and pertinacity makes it a match for much larger numbers. What is to be feared is, that want of interest in the subject on the part of the majority may make their defence insufficient, and that weariness of resisting reiterated attacks, may lead to the fatal concession of the principle of rating. Not that the clergy have anything to fear from rates in a selfish point of view. Their burden would be diminished instead of increased. I believe it would be difficult to find a parochial school where the clergyman's share of the expenses is under the amount for which he would be responsible under a principle of assessment. It is really tempting to throw their due share of the cost, by law, on those who have hitherto in so many instances buttoned up their pockets whenever they were asked to contribute, or who have subscribed ridiculously small sums in proportion to their property. Whether it would not be fairer to throw the whole increased cost of education on the Consolidated Fund, instead of adding to the burdens, already sufficiently heavy, on the land, is a question which we cannot discuss without travelling into matters foreign to our subject. Even this, however, might possibly, by the extinction of voluntary effort, be fatal to the Denominational system, and that system I feel sure that no personal considerations will induce the clergy to imperil.

For the present, I trust that the prevailing feeling in favour of religious education, joined to a still more extended dislike to the payment of rates, will temporarily stave off the secular system. But if we hope to do more than merely delay it, we must set vigorously to work to supply the defects which its pro-

moters call for it to remedy. We must show that the existing system can be extended so as to become virtually universal. There are many parishes into which it has not yet penetrated. Is there a cause for this which can be ascertained? and if so, can such cause be removed? I believe the cause to be, in almost all cases, want of funds. I can hardly suppose that there would be a single parish without a school, if one could be established and maintained at a reasonable expense to the clergyman. Those clergymen must be few indeed who would not undertake the task, if it were fairly within their power. I am only surprised at the number who have accomplished the work, considering the trouble and the vexation which have to be incurred,—the refusal of assistance, from the insolently rude to the coldly civil; the correspondence with the Committee of Council, distractingly voluminous and intricate; and, finally, the adverse balance, which no begging can make up, to be defrayed out of private resources. It can surprise nobody that many men, quite ready to do their duty, shrink from such a task as this, especially as the difficulty is by no means over when the school is established; but let the same men find that they can have schools without any unreasonable demand on their pockets, and there is no doubt that they will be only too happy to establish them.

One thing which shows that the obstacle to the universal extension of schools is in most cases a pecuniary one, is that the parishes which hitherto have not benefited by the educational grants are generally of one character, namely, of very small extent and population; and that it is just in such parishes that the maintenance of a school is comparatively most difficult. The chief reason of this is that the salary of the teacher is not in proportion to the size of the school, but is not very different in a small school and a large one, while in the former the means of payment are much less.

Can we, then, find any way of extending the existing system by such help to poor parishes as to give the clergy a fair chance of building and maintaining schools? Let it be remembered that the aid hitherto given has been designed rather to raise the standard, both of buildings and teaching, than to lighten the cost. The Government conditions are not more than paid for by the grants-in-aid. The general results of this system have been

wonderfully good. People who could afford schools have got much better ones for their money, and an educational standard has been created in the country. But this does not help people who cannot afford schools at all; and, accordingly, as might have been expected, school extension has come rather to a standstill. In order to carry it further we must increase the grant, or relax the conditions, or both. A third plan has been proposed, viz., to unite small parishes in groups, and thus to have the same conditions to deal with as in larger ones. But this, whether on the plan known as Miss Burdett Coutts', or any other, will always meet with a difficulty which I believe to be insuperable, that is, the difficulty of getting school managers in different parishes to pull together for any length of time. I believe that, in the country at least, we must deal with parishes as separate and independent, however great may be the hypothetical advantages of union. We thus arrive at rather a curious result of our parochial system, that on the arbitrary condition of the size of the parish, which would appear to have nothing to do with the matter, the facilities for education, in an important degree, depend.

The point where the difficulty of introducing the Government system into small schools meets us, is that, when the number of children is small, the grants payable on their account do not constitute a sufficient addition to the school funds to admit of paying the salary of a certificated teacher. Thus, the school not being able to fulfil the condition of employing such a teacher, gets no help at all.

In order to remedy this, two plans are possible, one to increase the grants, so as to make up the salary required, the other to dispense with the condition of a certificate. The former plan would involve the difficulty of having an increased scale of grants for small schools, unless, indeed, the portion of the grant now given according to the average attendance were made a fixed sum for all schools, with the express object of assisting in the salary of a certificated teacher. This would not only help the small schools out of their difficulty, but would save a good deal of public money now bestowed in unnecessary grants to large schools, the scholars of which can afford high fees, besides there being plenty of rich subscribers. I have always considered it to be a great mistake in the present system of grants that they are

in direct proportion to the size of the school; whereas, in general, the larger the school, the less assistance it wants. I do not believe, however, that there is any present probability of a change being made in this respect by which the smaller schools can benefit.

Let us, therefore, turn to the other alternative. Can the condition of the teachers holding a certificate be relaxed without material injury to the system? The authorities of the Council Office say that any such relaxation would be destructive—that people would be tempted, by lower salaries, to employ uncertificated teachers, and that the standard, raised with so much labour and cost, would speedily decline. On the other hand, it is argued that the principle of payment by results having been adopted, the results ought to be paid for, in whatever manner they may be produced. If a boy can pass in reading, and spell correctly, and do his sums right, how can it matter by whom, or by what process he has been brought to this point of proficiency? This argument, notwithstanding its assurance and show of reason, is not difficult to answer. It holds only on the supposition that the modicum of acquirement, known by the term "results," constitutes the whole of education. If that be the case, no doubt it does not matter who the teacher may be. But, if education means the whole intellectual and moral training, it matters very much indeed. The indirect influence of the teacher is an element of the greatest importance. Take two children who pass the same examination in results. One has been taught just the necessary amount of mechanical skill, and no more. It has been a weary, dry task, enforced against the grain, without a particle of interest or pleasure. The reading is about as intelligent as that of a schoolboy in a Latin author whom he cannot construe, and is scarcely a more valuable possession. The mind is utterly uncultivated. The ideas run in the narrowest compass. The vocabulary corresponds. Not a single one of the new words acquired in reading has really enriched it. One half of the books read, if they are worth reading, has been unintelligible, for want of collateral knowledge. If you question so as really to ascertain the interpretation put upon what is read, you will find it strangely wrong. And no wonder, when there is not a word beyond the range of cottage conversation, or a proper name beyond those of the

family and village, of the meaning of which the child has the remotest conception, while, at the same time, many words have a sufficient resemblance to those which are familiar to occasion ludicrous mistakes. In such a case, whatever may be the results displayed at the examination, there has been positively no education. All that has been learned will be forgotten the moment the school pressure is taken off. Books, for which a thorough disgust has been inspired, will be joyfully cast aside, unless, perhaps, the discovery be made that there is a literature opened by the reading faculty which, at least, has not the fault of being dull, and which requires no knowledge for its comprehension except that of which most people have a great deal too much. On the other hand, you will have another child, to whom the subjects of examination have been taught as part of a general culture, which has enlarged and strengthened the mind while furnishing it with interesting and useful knowledge. The acquirement of new ideas has kept pace with that of new words. The power of reading has carried with it the power of understanding and appreciating what is worth reading. The two children are alike in nothing but mechanical attainment. If you choose to appraise them by the standard they have passed, you can of course do so, as you might by their height, or their weight, or any other arbitrary standard, but the difference between them is that the one is educated, and the other is not.

Payment by results is an admirable plan, if you estimate your results rightly; but if there are certain palpable results quite easy to ascertain, and others which cannot be determined without difficulty, and you pay only for those which are easily tested, your intention is very imperfectly fulfilled, especially if the easily-tested results form the least important part of the whole. This is just the case with education. Anybody who can hold a book and cast up a sum can tell whether a child can pass a given standard; but there is no practically applicable test of the amount of real education which accompanies this proficiency. How, then, are you to secure that the child shall have it? The only plan is to employ a teacher who is qualified for his office —a teacher, not a mere grinder—an artist, not a tradesman. This fully justifies the general condition that the "results" paid for must be acquired under a teacher with a certificate of competency for his office.

I do not assert that the certificate even is an infallible test. Some certificated teachers are mere grinders. Some teachers who have no certificate are of the highest order of merit. About this a good deal has been written on false assumptions. For instance, it is argued that, as a medical man is not allowed to practise without learning his profession, so a schoolmaster ought not to be allowed to teach without previous training. But the cases are not analogous, for this reason, that there is no such thing as an innate knowledge of medicine qualifying a man to practise, whereas, of the teacher of the first order it may be said, "Nascitur, non fit." There is no gift more special bestowed on mankind than this. No training can come up to it. The best that training can do is to make a good approximation to it out of ordinary material. And let it be remembered that the elementary teacher, unlike the medical man, requires no special knowledge beyond what everybody ought to know. He may therefore, if he has the natural gift, be qualified without any training except practice. It is scarcely necessary to say that this natural qualification, in any high degree, is rare; but in a lower degree it is not uncommonly met with. It is often brought out by circumstances in the case of persons who have not before turned their minds to the subject, and have been occupied in other professions. Some of the best teachers I have known have begun in this way. One schoolmaster, of the first order, had been a journeyman carver and gilder, and had begun by teaching in a Sunday-school. Another had been the skipper of a collier. One of the best female teachers I ever knew had been led to adopt the profession by being left a widow, without means of support. Those who thus take to teaching late in life are often very ill-fitted to pass examinations, and can seldom do themselves justice. Thus, some of the best teachers have either failed to get certificates, or have only got them after repeated trials. And let it be remembered that the certificate does not necessarily imply training, though people often argue as if it did. It can be obtained by any teacher in charge of a school who can pass a given examination, his school being at the same time approved by the Inspector. Such a teacher is often very little, if at all, better than his uncertificated brother, who cannot get over a nervous dread of examinations, and is by that prevented from doing him-

self justice, or perhaps even from presenting himself at all. Still the certificate is far the best testimonial, and often the only one which can be relied on at all. The exceptionally good teachers who are without it are few and far between.

But, acknowledging all the advantages of employing a certificated teacher, may it not be better to recognise the results produced without that condition, than to have no school at all? I can conceive only one answer to this question. Take the extreme case of a teacher only able to produce the dry results. There is no doubt these are better than nothing; nay, that they have their value, though not constituting education in themselves. They are instruments, which are capable of being turned to good account. And it is by no means certain that the humble teachers of small schools will be found devoid of the higher qualifications above spoken of. The money paid for the results of examination, therefore, would bring at least its due return. And I think that much would be done to improve the school, by giving the teacher a definite aim, encouraging him by increased salary, according to his success, and also by the annual visit of the Inspector, from whose examination and advice he would be enabled to learn a great deal of what a school ought to be. The managers also would, I believe, be led to increased interest and exertion.

So far it seems to me that the relaxation of the existing conditions would do unmixed good. I should not, however, advocate the entire abolition of the requirement that the teacher should hold a certificate. I would still make this necessary for the reception of the part of the grant paid upon average attendance. This would remove the temptation to save money by employing uncertificated teachers, except in schools so small that this addition to the grant would not cover the increase of salary necessary to secure a certificated teacher. I would also require a certificate as a condition of being allowed to have pupil teachers. With these reservations, I do not see why the paying for results should tend to throw certificated teachers out of employment. It argues very small confidence in their superior merits to suppose that managers of schools will not employ them where they have the means; but even if it be supposed that managers are so ignorant or indifferent as to be only bent on cheapness, the proposed plan will not tempt them to employ

uncertificated teachers except in those small schools which can get no help at all under the existing conditions, but which the amount of help proposed would very much tend to improve.

We have hitherto spoken of maintenance only. If, however, it is an object to set up a school in every parish, there must be some means of facilitating the erection of suitable buildings. The difficulty is now sufficient to deter all who are not zealous enough to undertake a thankless and expensive duty. Here I do not think the conditions should be relaxed. I have known deplorable evils result from improper school buildings, contracted space, bad ventilation, and brick or stone floors. The only alternative is to increase the grants. But, in addition to this, it would be a great boon, if legal means were afforded of spreading the payment of the cost of building over a term of years, as is the case when money has been borrowed on the security of Church-rates. A voluntary rate, if it could be so confirmed by law as to be a security for borrowing money, would in all probability be agreed to in many places where it is impossible to get the amount all at once.

By these, or similar means, I think a great extension of our present system might be made, sufficient to meet the demand for the supply of which education by rates is now called for. If this cannot be accomplished, that demand can no longer be resisted. The occasion needs all our exertions. If the withdrawn Government Bill be again brought forward, I hope the clergy will use their influence to secure its passing. It met the difficulty of the "Conscience Clause" with a proposition which, it seems to me, the Church might accept without any compromise of her just claims. To exempt Nonconformists, on the one hand, from teaching, which they conscientiously object to, and to secure to the Church, on the other hand, full liberty of teaching, were surely conditions perfectly fair to both parties. By accepting these terms, the Church will be doing more to maintain her character as the Church of the nation and not a sect, than by taking up an exclusive position. She may be glad to get the children of separatists under the indirect influence of her teaching, though in lessons merely secular, and though she would scorn to evade her obligations by introducing even a word with proselytising intention.

I trust the importance of the crisis will be realised, for that,

in this matter, we are now on our trial, I am very strongly convinced. If, from apathy or disunion, or any other cause, we fail, we must look to be thrust out of our place as educators of the people, and to have to feed the lambs of our flock under the double disadvantage of want of the means and appliances of instruction, and of an antagonistic system pre-occupying the minds of the whole rising generation with opinions destructive of the foundation of our teaching, and neutralising the efficacy of our exhortations and warnings by intellectual pride and unbelief.

ALEXANDER R. GRANT.

ESSAY V.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST, &c.

By the EDITOR.

ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

IMPORTANCE of the subject. Ritualism not confined to the accessories of public worship. Doctrine involved.

Change of phraseology respecting the Holy Sacrament foreign to our Reformed notions.

Ritualistic opinions. Mr. Mackonochie's address. Bishop of Salisbury. Address to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Witnesses before the Ritual Commission.

Gist of the question. Whether the presence of Christ is to be sought for in the consecrated elements, or in the heart of the faithful receiver. Objective and subjective presence. Presence localised in the elements contrary to Article XXIX. Mr. Keble's explanation. Unsatisfactory. Opinion of our Reformers on the point at issue. Mr. Mackonochie's doctrine identical with Bishop Gardiner's.

"Under the form of bread and wine." Extracts from the Homilies with reference to these words. Bishop of Exeter's testimony.

Article XXVIII., "The body of Christ is *given*, taken, and eaten," &c.

1. If pressed literally, allow a corporal presence. This contrary to the history of the Article
2. Do they allow the real objective spiritual presence?

Mr. Taylor's explanation possibly the right one. But whole tenor of the Liturgy and Articles contradicts the notion. The alterations in successive Liturgies as affecting the question. Rubric in the Communion Service for the Sick against impanation. Bishop Guest's opinions contradictory: therefore not to be relied upon as conclusive.

But is there a difference between England and Rome on the subject?

'The Kiss of Peace.' Bold avowal of identity of doctrine.

Opponents of objective presence taunted with a refusal to accept Scripture literally. Unfair. Literal interpretation not always applicable. Dr. Pusey's opinion.

Question of sacrifice. Mr. Mackonochie's address. Extracts from devotional writings of the Ritualists.

Eucharistic sacrifice and localised objective presence in the elements hang together. Former cannot stand without the latter. Homilies do not uphold the doctrine of sacrifice. Hooker's testimony. How evaded. Doctrine of sacrifice carefully eliminated from the revised Liturgy. Judgment in Liddell *v.* Westerton.

Adoration of Christ in the Eucharist. In what sense true. Ritualistic sense different. Extracts from writings. Contrary to the Rubric at the end of the Communion Service.

Lukewarmness a betrayal of the Faith. Charity necessary, and prayer that God would guide His people into all Truth.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST

CONSIDERED IN CONNECTION WITH STATEMENTS RECENTLY PUT FORTH RESPECTING THAT HOLY SACRAMENT.

THE importance of the subject placed at the head of this paper cannot be over-rated. It seems to me that those who oppose ritualism merely as a form of service too elaborate, ornate, or gorgeous, who speak of it as though it only referred to the peculiar shape of a garment or the posture of the ministering clergyman, make a great mistake. Such errors might be condoned for the undoubted zeal, energy, and working power of many of the ritualistic party. But it is otherwise when, as we now see, these outward things are valued only as symbols of doctrine. It is impossible to read the writings of the more thoughtful members of that party without coming to the conclusion that with them it is no mere question of millinery—it is a struggle for doctrine—it is a hand-to-hand fight for what the one side deems truth, the other side deems error. Sad indeed it is that even around the sacred symbols of the Redeemer's Passion such strife should rage. Would that it were otherwise! Would that the pure faith of the reformed Church of England itself were not jeopardied by the assaults made against it. Would that the weapons of defence might be laid up to rust in the armoury, while the soldiers of Christ, without fear of attack, might gather round their Lord's table to the strengthening of their faith and the refreshment of their souls by the spiritual participation of the body and blood of Christ, without the jarring thought of controversy and false doctrine! But it cannot be so. Error on this point is of no trifling importance. It touches the faith in a vital part. It has ere now been resisted even unto death. God grant that the necessity may never again arise! And yet the prayer may surely ascend to the throne of

grace, that in this sad doctrinal struggle nothing may be said on either side against the law of charity, for self-glory or for victory, but that an earnest humble search for truth in dependence upon the promised help of God's good Spirit, may if it please Him help to make us all of one heart and one soul, united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, "so that we may with one mind and one mouth glorify God."

The writer of this Essay can honestly say that it is in such a spirit that he has entered upon the task which he has undertaken.

Now it is a fact which would not be disputed by any, that within the last few years a certain phraseology has become not uncommon amongst members of the Church of England respecting the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which a short time ago would have been well nigh universally repudiated. Such phraseology is pregnant with meaning. It indicates a new phase of feeling respecting this Sacrament. It implies that doctrines which our forefathers at any rate connected solely with the Romish Church are now held by many of those who rank themselves within the pale of the English Church.

Nor do words in this matter stand alone. Ritual is the language of dogma, and a new phraseology and a newly introduced ritual go hand-in-hand. The fact indeed that in certain quarters attempts are being made to elevate the general tone of doctrine respecting the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is not disavowed. Of course those who maintain that the doctrine of the English Church on this subject had fallen below the standard of truth, are right by every available method to attempt to advance their own views respecting it. Those, on the other hand, who think that grievous error is now being openly proclaimed by the more advanced portion of the ritualistic party on this subject, may surely be excused for protesting loudly against the importation of a phraseology foreign to our reformed notions, inculcating errors from which, at the time of the Reformation, our Church was purged. It may be that the language of our formularies may admit of being construed so as to cover very widely different views on the subject of the Eucharist. Upon *that* I give no opinion, nor indeed is it a subject to be discussed in the present Essay. It belongs to the tribunals proper for the

adjudication of such questions.* But my firm belief is that the views of moderate Churchmen respecting the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper are more in accordance with the general spirit and tenor of our Liturgy and Articles than the opinions which have been recently broached in our Church. I believe that such opinions loudly and pertinaciously set forth are doing our Church grievous harm in the minds of the people. They at any rate associate them with Romish doctrines, they hear statements of the most opposite character asserted as truths by members of the same Church, and they are led to ask somewhat impatiently, "If our spiritual guides thus differ, how are we the uninitiated to know what is true and what is false, what the Church really teaches and what she really repudiates?" That our English Church has ever allowed a certain latitude of opinion within her pale is undeniable. But at the same time a stand must be made somewhere:—

"Sunt certi denique fines
Quos ultra citraque nequit consistere rectum."

What then are the opinions which are now agitating our Church?

I have no wish to misrepresent those who hold them, or to impute to any that which they would disown, and shall therefore give them in their own words.

Mr. Mackonochie, of St. Alban's, in an address issued to his parishioners, thus writes:—

"Still we feel that a gorgeously conducted service ought to mean something. It does mean something—it means that the Holy Eucharist is the sacrament of Christ's body and blood—'the body and blood of Christ under the form of bread and wine.' As I have always tried to teach you plainly, without concealing anything which I believe that the Church of England, as part of the one true Catholic Church, bids me teach, I have only here to repeat what I

* It seems almost certain now that the question will come before our ecclesiastical law courts, and be finally decided. In the Court of Queen's Bench a rule has been made absolute for a *mandamus* to the Bishop of London, directing him to hear and determine a complaint against the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, Vicar of Frome, for the publication of alleged heretical and unsound doctrine within the diocese of London, in his book entitled 'A Plea for Toleration,' and his essay in a volume entitled 'The Church and the World,' edited by the Rev. Orby Shipley, headed "Some results of the Tractarian movement of 1833." The Bishop of London in consequence has issued a Commission for the trying of the case.

have in divers ways said before. In doing so it is well to remember that the leading English Reformers did not deny the reality of our Lord's Presence in the Holy Eucharist, but only contended that this Presence was supernatural and sacramental. Thus Ridley, when examined at Oxford as to his faith, six months before he was put to death, says, 'It is His true blood which is in the chalice, I grant, and the same which sprang from the side of Christ . . . . . but by way of a sacrament.' And just after, in answer to the objection, 'the sacrament of the blood is not the blood,' he says, 'The sacrament of the blood is the blood, and that is attributed to the sacrament (*i.e.*, according to the language of the times, the 'outward part') which is meant of the thing of the sacrament (*i.e.*, the 'inward part'). I believe, and therefore have taught, that in the Holy Communion the body and blood of Christ are present 'really and essentially,' as is by inference asserted in the rubric at the end of the Communion Service; are 'verily and indeed (*i.e.*, not figuratively, but as an existing reality) taken and received by the faithful (*i.e.*, according to the theological meaning of the word, all Christians) in the Lord's Supper;' therefore, that they are present there as an existing reality. I believe, and therefore have always taught you, that the 'body and blood of Christ are' objectively 'given' by the priest, objectively 'taken' by every communicant, and subjectively 'received and eaten by faith' unto salvation by such as come to the Lord's Supper with right dispositions. I believe that (inasmuch as our Lord is one person, and incapable of division) this Presence is the Presence of God the Word Incarnate, not after a material or local, or corporeal or earthly mode of existence, but after a fashion supralocal, supernatural, 'heavenly and spiritual,' yet 'real and essential'—not the less 'real and essential' because 'heavenly and spiritual,' nor the less 'heavenly and spiritual' because 'real and essential.' The Presence of the Godhead in the mortal body of the Son of Mary was not merely local, but infinite. It might improperly be said to be local, because the human body was a thing of space, and so local; but properly the Presence of God was infinite, supernatural, spiritual. So, in regard to the Holy Eucharist, I believe Him to be locally present only in heaven, which He has localised by His ascension in the flesh; but supralocally (as has been said by most thoughtful theologians) He is present, both in His Godhead and in His manhood—which he has taken unto His Godhead, though without making it like that Godhead ubiquitous—according to His own will, wherever and whenever the sacramental conditions which He has laid down are fulfilled. This Presence I believe to be conferred by the Word of Christ as spoken by the priest, through the operation of God the Holy Ghost irre-

spective of faith or any personal qualifications either in the consecrator or receiver. I believe that the elements of bread and wine remain in their own natural material substance; yet that they are 'after consecration not that which nature formed, but that which the benediction has consecrated and by consecration changed.' . . . God made bread and wine of the dust of the earth. God the Holy Ghost breathes over it in the act of consecration. It does not cease to be what it was before, but it becomes what it was not before—the life-giving body and blood of Christ. . . . . I believe that He (Jesus Christ) sent His priests, as His Father had sent Him, to be priests in earth. I believe that by the power of this consecration, and by the continual presence which He has promised with His priests, He does now, as in heaven so in earth (here as there, although under earthly veils, Himself both priest and victim), offer in each Eucharist the same one all-sufficient sacrifice. I believe that our Eucharists are true sacrifices, not as separate and independent, not as repeated sacrifices, but because they are the continual presentation and pleading with the Father here on earth, of the same one Sacrifice once finished upon the cross and now presented and pleaded continually by him in His own person in heaven—by Him too in a mystery on earth. I believe that in administering the Lord's Supper the priest gives to every communicant 'verily and indeed' the heavenly food of this divine sacrifice; that every communicant takes from the priest 'verily and indeed' this same food; that the wicked receive Him to their great condemnation, and that those who are prepared by God the Holy Ghost receive him to life eternal. This I have been taught by the Church of England to receive and believe most firmly. Take from me my faith in God's word incarnate present in the sacrament, and with it I lose God's word written in Holy Scripture—the two go together. Take from me this faith, and with it you rob me of the Prayer Book and Articles of the Church of England, by robbing them of their claim to be understood in their full grammatical sense."

In like manner the Bishop of Salisbury writes:—

"Our Church witnesses that through Consecration the Body and Blood of Christ become really present, and by this I mean 'present *without* us,' and not *only* '*in* the soul of the faithful receiver,' or to use words very familiar, ... the Body and Blood of Christ are present objective, and not subjective only. . . . . With regard to the commemorative, impetratory sacrifice offered in the Holy Communion, every one who accepts the witness of the Church to the truth of this Doctrine, and is fair

minded, must admit that the teaching of our Church on the subject is less explicit than on the truth of the Real Presence. . . . . Still the doctrine of Sacrifice has most certainly its place in our service, for it is inseparable from that act of Consecration which alone makes a real Communion with Christ's Sacramental life possible."—Charge, 1867, 75, 81, 82.

The document following is a memorial which was presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury at the end of May in the past year, signed by twenty-one clergymen, including Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison :—

"*To his Grace Charles Thomas, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and Metropolitan, &c.*

"Whereas at this present time, imputations of disloyalty to the Church of England are current, to the discredit of those who have been, some of them for many years, inculcating and defending the doctrines of the Real objective Presence, of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and of the Adoration of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament; and whereas by reason of these imputations the minds of many are troubled: We therefore, the undersigned, exercising the office of the Priesthood within the Church of England, beg respectfully to state to your Grace, and through your Grace to our Right Reverend Fathers in God the Bishops of your Province, and to the Church at large, what we believe to be the mind of our Lord, touching the said doctrines, as expressed in Holy Scripture, and as received by the Church of England in conformity with the teaching of the Catholic Church in those ages to which the Church of England directs us as 'most pure and uncorrupt,' and of 'the old godly doctors' to whom she has in many ways referred us, declaring hereby both what we repudiate and what we believe, touching the said doctrines.

"(1). We repudiate the opinion of a 'Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood,' that is to say, of the presence of His Body and Blood as they 'are in heaven;' and the conception of the mode of His presence, which implies the physical change of the natural substances of the Bread and Wine commonly called 'Transubstantiation.'

"We believe that in the Holy Eucharist, by virtue of the

Consecration, through the power of the Holy Ghost, the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, 'the inward part or thing signified,' are Present really and truly, but Spiritually and ineffably, under 'the outward visible part or sign,' or 'form of bread and wine.'

"(2). We repudiate the notion of any fresh Sacrifice, or any view of the Eucharistic Sacrificial offering as of something apart from the One All-sufficient Sacrifice and Oblation on the Cross, Which Alone 'is that perfect Redemption, Propitiation, and Satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual,' and which Alone is 'meritorious.'

"We believe that as in Heaven Christ our Great High Priest ever offers Himself before the Eternal Father, pleading by His presence His Sacrifice of Himself once offered on the Cross; so on Earth in the Holy Eucharist, that same Body, once for all sacrificed for us, and that same Blood once for all shed for us, Sacramentally Present, are offered and pleaded before the Father, by the Priest, as our Lord ordained to be done in Remembrance of Himself when He instituted the Blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood.

"(3). We repudiate all 'adoration' of 'the Sacramental Bread and Wine,' which would be 'idolatry;' regarding them with the reverence due to them because of their Sacramental relation to the Body and Blood of our Lord; we repudiate, also, all adoration of 'a Corporal Presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood'—that is to say, 'of the Presence of His Body and Blood as They are in Heaven.'

"We believe that Christ Himself, really and truly, but Spiritually and ineffably, Present in the Sacrament, is therein to be adored." . . . .

It may be well to add to the above statements some of the answers of the leaders of the Ritualistic movement to certain questions put to them by members of the Ritual Commission.

Thus the Rev. C. J. Le Geyt, in answer to Mr. J. Abel Smith:—

"496. You were good enough to state that you understood certain things to be implied by the lighted candles; could you also state what doctrine or meaning you attach to the vestments?

—The vestments I take to mean a distinctive dress for the priest at the time of celebrating the Holy Communion.

"497. Not as implying any particular opinion or doctrine?—I can hardly say that. I should say it would imply doctrine.

"498. What doctrine?—I should certainly think the use of the chasuble would imply the belief in the doctrine of sacrifice, —Eucharistic sacrifice—that being the object of a distinctive dress.

"499. Will you explain to me what you mean by that, for I do not quite understand how you connect that with the sacrifice?—It has been thought that the priest offering this sacrifice at the Holy Communion should have a distinctive dress to mark him off from the rest of the ministers, as being the principal priest in office, offering the sacrifice at the time."

Rev. G. Nugee, in reply to Sir Joseph Napier, says:—

"2117. (Sir Joseph Napier). I suppose you regard the Communion service as sacrificial and propitiatory?—I do not quite know what you mean by propitiatory. It is a sacrifice."

Rev. W. J. E. Bennett is very outspoken:—

"2604. (Mr. Beresford Hope). At what time do you use the chasuble?—At all times of the celebration of the Holy Communion.

"2605. Is there any mysterious signification in the chasuble, or in wearing it?—That is a question which involves doctrine. If I am to be launched into doctrine, of course that again will involve an immensely long discussion.

"2606. I think it does not require a very long answer to say whether there is any doctrine involved in your using the chasuble?—I think there is.

"2607. What is that doctrine?—The doctrine of the sacrifice.

"2608. Do you consider yourself a sacrificing priest?—Yes.

"2609. In fact, *sacerdos*, a sacrificing priest?—Distinctly so.

"2611. Then you think you offer a propitiatory sacrifice?—Yes, I think I do offer a propitiatory sacrifice."

And in like manner Mr. Bennett, in his Essay on 'Some results of the Tractarian movement of 1833,' published in

the second series of 'Essays on Questions of the day,' thus writes:—

"Now, the ancient vestments present to crowds of worshippers the fact that here before God's altar is something far higher, far more awful, more mysterious than aught that man can speak of, namely, the Presence of the Son of God in human flesh subsisting." (p. 13.)

And again, after quoting a prayer for Unity from the Missal:—

"And this prayer we say (to use the word common to us all) in the Mass which we now offer in many places daily on our altars." (p. 19.)

Much more of a similar character might be quoted, but the above extracts are sufficient to show what is the doctrine of the advanced Ritualists on the subject of the Real Presence. They have at any rate the merit of speaking plainly. No one can misunderstand them. Their object is clearly set forth, and they seek to attain that object by an openly-planned and openly-prosecuted campaign. It remains to be seen whether the issue will be in their favour or not. If it were ever authoritatively decided that such doctrines as those mentioned above were the doctrines of the Church of England to the exclusion of all others, there would be such a secession from her ranks as would overthrow the National Church itself *quà* national.

It may with truth be said that the gist of the question turns upon the fact whether the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist is in the consecrated elements, or (not in them but) in the heart of the faithful receiver; in other words, whether it is objective or subjective.* If Christ is so present in the consecrated

* As this is the first time that I make use of the words "objective" and "subjective" I wish to state once for all that I use the word *objective* throughout this Essay in its popular sense, as referring to impanation; and *subjective*, as making the presence of our Blessed Lord dependent upon the faith of the communicant. I can conceive some persons using the words *objective presence* to express their belief that at the Eucharist we may expect a special presence of Christ, not only in the communicants' hearts; but also in, with, and around all the assembled body of communicants, and yet that presence may not be localised, or confined to, or specially in the consecrated elements. This may or may not be true. It is not what is usually understood when the term "objective presence" is used. That expression is popularly used to indicate, as Mr. Taylor expresses it, a "presence localised in the consecrated elements, and independent of the state of mind of the communicant."—Taylor 'On the so-called real objective presence,' p. 4.

With regard to the use of another term common to both the Church of England and of Rome—the Real Pre-

elements that the body and blood of Christ are "objectively given, and objectively taken by every communicant," it follows that the unfaithful communicant does "eat the body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper," which is plainly repugnant to the 29th Article.

Nor indeed is the inference denied. In a protest published by Mr. Keble, in 1856, we read:—

"That the interpretation of Scripture most commonly held in the Church has been, that the wicked, although they can 'in no wise be partakers of Christ,' nor 'spiritually eat His flesh and drink His blood,' yet do in the Sacrament not only take, but eat and drink unworthily to their own condemnation, the Body and Blood of Christ, which they do not discern."—Keble, on 'Eucharistical Adoration,' fourth edition, p. 199.

Or, if this be not conceded, there is another way of avoiding the difficulty. For even if it be absolutely necessary to understand the 29th Article as denying "all eating, in any sense, of the Holiest Thing by the wicked and unworthy, not even so could it be inferred that the framers of that Article shrunk from the doctrine of a real Objective Presence in respect of the good and faithful; nor does the Article, so understood, contradict the notion which has commended itself to some, that there is at first a Real Presence to all, but that it is withdrawn when the unbeliever communicates."—Keble, on 'Euch. Ad.,' p. 172.

I say it most reverently, but such a contrivance as this does seem a most clumsy arrangement of a double miracle in order

---

sence—the following remarks of Bishop Nicholson are much to be noted:—

"The word *really* is diversely taken; for, sometimes,

"1st. It is opposed to that which is feigned and is but imaginary, and imports as much as *truly*.

"2nd. It is opposed to that which is merely figurative and barely representative, and imports as much as *effectually*.

"3rd. It is opposed to that which is spiritual, and imports as much as *corporally* or *bodily*. We then believe Christ to be present in the Eucharist divinely after a special manner, spiritually in the hearts of the communicants; sacramentally" (that is, as had been just before explained, 'because he hath ordained the sacrament to represent, and communicate Christ's death to us') "or relatively" (that is, that 'He is there under the forms of bread and wine, not changed in substance but in use, as it is in other relations; as, for example, betwixt a father and son, who, though they relate to each other, yet they remain two distinct substances, and the same they were'), "in the elements. And this presence of his is real, in the two former acceptations of real; but not in the last, for He is truly and effectually there present, though not corporally, bodily, carnally, locally."—Bishop Nicholson's 'Exposition of the Catechism of the Church of England,' Anglo-Catholic Library edition, p. 179; quoted in the Bishop of Winchester's 'Charge,' 1854, pp. 65, 66.

to evade the plain words of the 29th Article. Expressions seem to have been changed and multiplied by the framers of that Article, in order, if possible, to avoid any misconception on so important a point.* Both the positive and the negative side of the question is clearly put. Thus, the title runs:—

"Art. XXIX. Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper."

And the whole Article:—

"The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint *Augustine* saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing."

If the wicked only eat the sign or sacrament of the body of the Lord without being *in any wise* partakers of Christ, then it seems to follow clearly that consecration cannot so change the elements of bread and wine as that they shall be in themselves the body and blood of Christ. The presence must be subjective, not objective. In other words, there is no "presence localised in the consecrated elements, and independent of the state of mind of the communicant."—Taylor 'On the So-called Real objective Presence,' p. 4.

The language of our Reformers is clear and explicit on this point.

Thus Cranmer:—"Evil men do not eat Christ's flesh nor drink his blood, for the Scripture saith expressly: 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him,' which is not true of ill men."—Cranmer's 'Works,' P. S., p. 12.

"They that to the outward eating of the bread join not

* If it had been intended that Article XXIX. should merely express the truth that wicked men do not in the Sacrament partake of Christ to the benefit of their souls, the framers of that Article would surely have simply inserted the actual words of St. Augustine, which run thus (the words between brackets are supposed by the Benedictine editors to have been interpolated):—"By this, he who abides not in Christ, nor Christ in him, without doubt eats not [spiritually] His Flesh nor drinks His Blood [though he carnally and visibly press with his teeth the Sacrament of His Body and Blood]; but rather, he eats and drinks, to his condemnation, the Sacrament of so great a thing." The framers of the Article, it will be observed, left out the word "spiritually" in the title, and in the Article itself added the words "in nowise are they partakers of Christ," and explained the word "sacrament," in the last clause, to mean simply "sign," as though to avoid the possibility of misconception. See Harold Browne 'On the Thirty-nine Articles,' p. 727.

thereto an inward eating of Christ by faith, they have no warrant by Scripture at all, but the bread and wine to them be vain, nude, and bare tokens." (p. 17.)

"They say that Christ is corporally under, or in the forms of bread and wine: we say that Christ is not there, neither corporally *nor spiritually;* but in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine, he is spiritually, and corporally in heaven." (p. 54.)

And again, still more strongly:—

"When I say and repeat many times in my book that the body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the Sacrament, lest any man should mistake my words, and think that I mean that although Christ be not corporally in the outward visible signs, yet he is corporally in the persons that duly receive them; this is to advertise the reader that I mean no such thing; but my meaning is, that the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ's body that was crucified for us, and of his blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the Sacraments, but all this I understand of his spiritual presence, of the which he saith, *I will be with you until the world's end,* and *Wheresoever two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them:* and *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him.* Nor no more truly is he corporally or really present in the due ministration of the Lord's Supper, than he is in the due ministration of Baptism [that is to say in both spiritually by grace."]—Preface to Cranmer's 'Disputations against Gardiner.' Parker Soc., p. 3. The last sentence is only found in the edition of 1580.

It is needless to multiply passages. There can be no doubt that Cranmer held the theory of the subjective presence of Christ spiritually in the heart of the worthy receiver.

And here it may be well to refer to the quotation from Ridley's words as given in the extract from Mr. Mackonochie's address. It seems strange at first sight that the Reformer, who sealed his testimony to the truth by his life's blood, should be brought forward as a witness on the Ritualists' side. How far his witness is really in their favour will be seen at once if we place Mr. Mackonochie's quotations side by side with the whole passage from which they are extracted. The words quoted occur

in his disputation at Oxford, and may be found at length in his Works published by the Parker Soc., p. 237.

As quoted by Mr. Mackonochie.

"It is His true blood which is in the chalice, I grant, and the same which sprang from the side of Christ . . . .

but by way of a sacrament."

And just after, in answer to the objection, "The sacrament of the blood is not the blood," he says, "The sacrament of the blood is the blood, and that is attributed to the sacrament" (*i. e.*, according to the language of the times, 'the outward part') "which is meant of the thing of the sacrament" (*i. e.*, the 'inward part').

The whole passage.

"It is His true blood which is in the chalice, I grant, and the same which sprang from the side of Christ. But how? It is blood indeed, but not after the same manner, after which manner it sprang from his side. For here is the blood, but by way of a sacrament. Again I say, like as the bread of the sacrament and of thanksgiving is called the body of Christ given for us; so the cup of the Lord is called the blood which sprang from the side of Christ; but that sacramental bread is called the body, because it is the sacrament of his body. Even so likewise the cup is called the blood also which flowed out of Christ's side, because it is the sacrament of that blood which flowed out of his side, instituted of the Lord himself for our singular commodity, namely, for our spiritual nourishment; like as baptism is ordained in water to our spiritual regeneration."

Curtop.—"The Sacrament of the blood is not the blood."

Ridley.—"The sacrament of the blood is the blood; and that is attributed to the sacrament, which is spoken of the thing of the sacrament."

(Here Weston repeateth Curtop's argument in English.)

Weston.—"That which is in the chalice is the same which flowed out of Christ's side."

"But there came out very blood."

"*Ergo*, There is very blood in the chalice."

Ridley.—"The blood of Christ is in the chalice indeed, but not in the real presence, but by grace and in a sacrament."

Weston.—"That is very well. Then we have blood in the chalice."

Ridley.—"It is true; but by grace and in a sacrament."

(Here the people hissed at him.)—pp. 237, 238.

Certainly Mr. Mackonochie's doctrine touching the Lord's Supper more resembles Bishop Gardiner's than Ridley's. Witness the following parallel. Mr. Mackonochie says:—"A gorgeously conducted service ought to mean something. It does mean something—it means that the Holy Eucharist is the sacrament of Christ's body and blood"—"the body and blood of Christ under the form of bread and wine." Now what says Bishop Gardiner in his 'Explication and assertion of the true and godly doctrine of the most Holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ?' He says:—"Note here, reader, ... how untruely the true faith of the church is reported, which doth not teach that Christ is in the bread and wine (which was the doctrine of Luther), but the true faith is, that Christ's most precious body and blood is, by the might of his word and determination of his will, which he declareth by his word, in his holy Supper *present under form of bread and wine.*" —Cranmer's 'Works,' p. 51. If, then, we find Gardiner maintaining the identical doctrine which Mr. Mackonochie affirms, but which Cranmer equally plainly disavowed as the doctrine of the Church of England (see Cranmer's 'Works,' p. 53), let it not be said that those who maintain the old doctrine of the subjective presence are disloyal members of the Church of their fathers.

It is true that the words "under the form of bread and wine" are found in a notice appended to the first Book of Homilies, which runs as follows:—"Hereafter shall follow Sermons of Fasting, Prayer, Alms-deeds, of the Nativity, Passion, Resurrection and Ascension of our Saviour Christ: *of the due Receiving* of His blessed body and blood under the form of Bread and Wine: against Idleness, against Gluttony and Drunkenness, against Covetousness, against Envy, Ire, and Malice, with many other matters as well fruitful as necessary to the edifying of Christian people, and the increase of godly living." It will be observed that Mr. Mackonochie has omitted to quote the words marked in italics, which point to the worthy reception of the elements as essential to the real presence of Christ, or, in other words, which denote the subjective, not the objective presence.

But, further, it cannot surely be maintained that we subscribe to every single word and expression in all the Homilies. The 35th Article of our Church is most cautiously worded, and seems

to draw a distinction between the first and second Book of Homilies:—

"XXXV. *Of Homilies.*—The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of *Edward* the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in Churches by the Ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understanded of the people.

"Of the Names of the Homilies."

Then follow the titles of the Homilies in the 2nd book. The first book, which was published in the reign of Edward VI., had no treatise at all on the Eucharist. In the second book two Homilies are found on the subject. Certainly in the second book there is no countenance given to the opinion that therein Christ is present under the form of bread and wine. Witness the following extracts:—

"Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent: but as the Scripture saith, the table of the Lord, the bread and cup of the Lord, the memory of Christ, the annunciation of his death, yea, the communion of the body and blood of the Lord, in a marvellous incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost (the very bond of our conjunction with Christ), is through faith wrought *in the souls of the faithful*, whereby not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely trust to win their bodies a resurrection to immortality."—The first part of the Sermon concerning the Sacrament, p. 398. Ed. 1844. Oxf.

And again:—

"And truly as the bodily meat cannot feed the outward man unless it be let into a stomach to be digested, which is wholesome and sound; no more can the inward man be fed, except his meat be received into his soul and heart, sound and whole in faith. Therefore, saith Cyprian, when we do these things, we need not to whet our teeth; but with sincere faith we break and divide that whole bread. It is well known that the meat we seek for in this supper is spiritual food, the nourishment of our soul, a heavenly refection, and not earthly; an invisible meat and not bodily; a ghostly substance and not carnal; so that to

think that without faith we may enjoy the eating and drinking thereof, or that that is the fruition of it, is but to dream a gross carnal feeding, *basely objecting and binding ourselves to the elements* and creatures. . . . . Take then this lesson, O thou who art desirous of this table, of Emissenus, a godly father, that when thou goest up to the reverend communion, to be satisfied with spiritual meats, thou look up with faith upon the holy body and blood of thy God, thou marvel with reverence, thou touch it with the mind, thou receive it with the hand of thy heart, and thou take it fully with thy inward man." Ditto, pp. 399-400. Certainly there is no objective presence taught here.

Let us add to this the testimony of a much later divine. The word Sacrament is a word of ambiguous meaning, "sometimes and more strictly applied to the sign or matter, sometimes to the whole sacred rite. Now it is in the former sense that the Church of Rome holds the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament; it is in the latter that the real presence in the Sacrament maintained by the Church of England must be sought. The Church of Rome holds that the body and blood of Christ are present under the accidents of bread and wine: the Church of England holds that their *real presence is in the soul of the communicant* at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." Phillpotts', Bishop of Exeter, 'Letters to Charles Butler,' new edition, 1866, p. 120.

And again:—

"The crucified Jesus is present in the sacrament of his supper, not in, nor with, the bread and wine, nor under their accidents, but *in the souls of communicants*, not carnally, but effectually and fruitfully, and therefore most really." (p. 121.) "After the consecration of the bread and wine they are changed not in their nature but in their use . . . . instead of nourishing our bodies only, they now are instruments by which, *when worthily received*, God gives to our souls the body and blood of Christ to nourish and sustain them . . . ." p. 120.

It is true, as Mr. Mackonochie remarks, that the Church of England affirms in her twenty-eighth Article that the body of Christ is "given" as well as "taken and eaten," but surely the latter part of the sentence which qualifies and explains the whole ought never to be omitted by one who is desirous of candidly giving the real gist of the passage. "The body of Christ is given,

taken, and eaten in the supper *only after an heavenly and spiritual manner*. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is faith." In point of fact if the words "the body of Christ is given" be pressed in their literal meaning, without reference to the latter words of the Article, I do not see how they can be said to exclude a corporal presence. But yet this—to exclude the idea of corporal presence—was the very object of the paragraph in question. For when the Articles were first proposed for acceptance by Convocation in Queen Elizabeth's reign there was a long sentence in the twenty-eighth Article touching transubstantiation as follows:—

"For as much as the truth of man's nature requireth that the body of one and the self-same man cannot be at one time in divers places, but must needs be in one certain place, therefore the body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and divers places, and because, as Holy Scripture doth teach, Christ was taken up into heaven and there shall continue unto the end of the world, a faithful man ought not either to believe or openly confess the real and bodily presence, as they term it, of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." Now this was subscribed by the Houses of Convocation, but it was afterwards thought better that it should not be published, and the paragraph as it now stands was substituted in its stead, as, while maintaining the same doctrine, yet less likely to offend objectors. It could never have been intended to substitute a paragraph allowing corporal presence to be held for one distinctly and *totidem verbis* disavowing it which had been subscribed by both Houses of Convocation.*

If then corporal presence in the elements be disallowed by the words under consideration, are we not, it may be asked, at liberty to make use of them as teaching the real objective spiritual presence in the elements?

Now it must be granted, I think, that this word "given" if pressed literally and taken by itself is not inconsistent with the theory of the objective presence in the elements. Mr. Taylor, in his answer to 'The Kiss of Peace,' argues that the words are only intended to apply to the partaking by the faithful.

---

* In support of this, see Burnet 'On the 39 Articles.' Art. xxviii., p. 308, fol. ed. 1737.

He says:—

"The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. *And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is faith.* When in the first sentence the body of Christ is spoken of as 'given, taken, and eaten in the supper,' we must, I think, understand the same kind of reception intended as is expressed by 'received, and eaten in the supper' in the second. This identity of subject is still clearer in the Latin forms of the two paragraphs, which for convenience of comparison I place side by side:—

'*Corpus Christi* datur, *accipitur, et manducatur in Cœnâ*, tantum cœlesti et spirituali ratione.'	'Medium autem quo *corpus Christi accipitur, et manducatur in Cœnâ*, fides est.'

"The close parallelism of expression in these clauses would, I think, alone suffice to show that the two "manducations" are identical. In order, however, to have no doubt upon the point, I will prove that the Reformers were accustomed to speak of eating spiritually as equivalent to eating by faith."

Then follow passages from Cranmer against Gardiner, book II.; Cranmer I. 306, I. 317; Hooper, 'Confession of the Christian Faith,' II. 49; Jewell, 'Controversy with Harding,' II. 448-449.

This explanation of the passage may be the true interpretation. I myself, however, should prefer to rest upon the general tenor and spirit of the whole of the Liturgy and Articles of our Church, which general tenor is not to be contravened by one single word occurring in one Article. It certainly appears as though the revisers of our Liturgy in 1552 did take every pains to eliminate from the former Liturgy any expressions which might appear to countenance the real presence of Christ in the elements themselves. For instance in the address to communicants in the Liturgy of 1549 we find the following words:—

"And to the end that we should always remember the exceeding love of our master and only Saviour Jesu Christ thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which (by his precious bloodshedding) he hath obtained to us; *he hath left in those holy mysteries, as pledges of his love, and a continual remembrance of the same, his own blessed body and precious blood, for us to feed upon spiritually,* to our endless comfort and consolation."

Undoubtedly the change in 1552 of the words marked in

italics is doctrinally most significant. They were changed to the words now used:—

"He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of his love and (for a, added in 1662) continual remembrance of his death."

Nor does this change stand alone. What can be more significant than the following alteration in the prayer of consecration? In 1549 the words were:—

"O God, heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesu Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who made there (by his one oblation once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute and in his Holy Gospel command us to celebrate, a perpetual memory of that his precious death until his coming again; hear us (O merciful Father) we beseech thee: and with thy Holy Spirit and word *vouchsafe to bl✠ess and sanc✠tify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ.*"

Whereas in 1552 the latter words are:—

"*Grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesu Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood.*"

The effect of this alteration, as regarded impanation, was clearly pointed out by Dr. Scott, Bishop of Chester, in 1559, in a speech delivered by him "in the Parliament house against the bill of the Liturgy," or for uniformity of Common Prayer. "The Doctors of the Church," he said, "affirm that an intention to do that which Christ did, *i.e.*, to consecrate his body and blood, is a circumstance of absolute necessity. For this purpose the Church has appointed certain prayers in the canon of the mass to be said before the consecration; the words are these, 'Ut fiat nobis corpus et sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi,' *i.e.*, that the elements may be made unto us the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. There the intention of the Church and of the priest officiating is plainly declared; but in this new book there is neither any such intention declared nor any petition put up to God for that purpose. The contrary does rather appear by these words in their office, 'that we receiving these thy

creatures of bread and wine may,' &c., which words declare they intend nothing of consecration. And if so let them value themselves as they please upon their communion, it is to no manner of purpose, in regard the body of Christ is not there, which, as I have already observed, is the thing which should be communicated."—Collier's 'Ecc. Hist.,' vi. 244. See also Cardwell's 'Hist. of Conferences,' p. 112.

What then can be clearer than that the spirit of these changes was to set forth the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England, namely, that the presence of Christ is not to be sought for as localised in the elements themselves, but in the heart of the faithful partaker?

Once more. The third rubric at the end of the service for the Communion of the sick plainly shows the teaching of our Church upon this point. We are there taught that the body and blood of Christ may profitably be eaten and drunk, even although outwardly there be no administration of the Sacrament at all.

"¶ But if a man, either by reason of extremity of sickness, or for want of warning in due time to the Curate, or for lack of company to receive with him, or by any other just impediment, do not receive the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, the Curate shall instruct him, that if he do truly repent him of his sins, and stedfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the Cross for him, and shed his Blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefore, he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his Soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth."

No subtilty of argument can do away with the plain inference to be drawn from these words—namely, that the reception of Christ's body and blood depends upon the state of heart of the receiver and not upon the mere manducation of the elements,—in other words, that the presence of Christ is subjective, not objective.

It will be observed that I have not referred to the opinions of Guest, Bishop of Rochester, who drew up the clause in Art. XXVIII. in 1562: "The body of Christ is given," &c. I have not done so for this reason. It appears to me that quotations can be made from his writings diametrically opposed the one to the other.

Take the two following examples.

In a letter found in the State-Paper Office we read as follows:—

"If this Article (XXIX.) be confirmed* and authorised by the Queen's Grace, it will cause much business, because it is quite contrary to the Scriptures, and to the doctrine of the Fathers; for it is certain that Judas, as evil as he was, did receive Christ's body, because Christ said unto him 'Take, eat, this is my body.' It is not said, 'If thou be a good or a faithful man, take, eat, this is My Body; but simply without any such condition, 'Take, eat, this is my body.' So that to all men which be of the Church, and of the profession of Christ, whether they be good or bad, faithful or unfaithful, Christ's body is given and they do receive it."—Quoted in Grueber's 'Reply to the Remarks of the Rev. C. A. Heurtley, D.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity, Oxford,' p. 38.

Then, on the other hand, in a letter from the same Bishop Guest to "Sir William Cecyl, the Queen's Secretary, concerning the Service-book, newly prepared for the parliament to be confirmed; and certain ceremonies and usages of the church," we find the following passage concerning the Prayer in the first book for Consecration:—

"The second cause why the foresaid prayer is to be refused, is for that it prays that the bread and wine may be Christ's body and blood; which makes for the popish transubstantiation: which is a doctrine that hath caused much idolatry: and though the Doctors so speak, yet we must speak otherwise, because we take them otherwise than they meant, or would be taken. For when their meaning is corrupted their words must be expounded. In one place it is said, 'this is the new testament in my blood;' and in another place, 'this is my blood of the new testament.' Thus Christ's words be diversely reported, that we should expound them when they be mistaken. And both he and his Apostles allege not after the letter, but after the meaning."—Card. 'Conf.,' 53, 54.†

These two passages seem so wholly inconsistent the one with

* Notwithstanding this the Article was confirmed, which is presumptive evidence that the Church's doctrine was recognised as being antagonistic to the views here propounded by Guest.

† See also many passages from the same writer.—*Taylor*, 16-18.

the other that it is impossible, I think, to quote Bishop Guest on either side of the controversy in explanation of his own words, and therefore, as it seems to me, they must be explained in agreement with the mind and intent of the Reformed Church as ascertained from her formularies generally.

Now certainly it has generally been supposed that there is a wide gulf between England and Rome on the subject of the Eucharist. The annals of the Reformation period point in this direction. But it appears now that the Reformers were altogether mistaken upon this point!

One of the latest productions of the extreme school boldly proclaims that there is no difference whatever between England and Rome with reference to the Eucharist. The title of the book is, 'The Kiss of Peace, or England and Rome at one on the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. An Essay in two parts, by a Fellow of * * * College, Cambridge.' London: J. Hayes.

The dedication of the work runs as follows:—"To John Henry Newman, D.D., of the Roman Communion, and Edward Bouverie Pusey, D.D., of the Anglican Communion, through whose instrumentality, more than that of any other living men, the Holy Ghost would seem at this day to be carrying on the great work of Corporate Reunion, this humble effort to break down one of the barriers of separation between us is dedicated without their permission by one personally unknown to them, in token of sincere admiration of their work, and of deep gratitude to God from whom all such works do proceed."

Dr. Pusey would assuredly exclaim, "Save me from my friends." No ultra-Protestant of the straitest sect of Protestantism could more unequivocally assert the identity of the Roman doctrine respecting the Eucharist with that of the holders of the Real Objective Presence. One of themselves has said it. "It is commonly thought, and as I venture to maintain, rightly thought, that the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence does involve, or rather is simply another mode of expressing, the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation; and the plain fact, therefore, that our Church rejects some doctrine bearing this latter name, must ever prove an obstacle to the reception of the former doctrine, until it can be proved that the doctrine so rejected has nothing in common with the Roman doctrine save the name. When Archbishop Manning says that the clergy

of the Church of England are already saving his own clergy the necessity of preaching Transubstantiation, he says what I am glad to believe is true."—'Kiss of Peace,' pp. 54, 55.

There is one point in 'The Kiss of Peace' to which I must shortly refer. The opponents of the objective presence are oftentimes taunted with the accusation that they refuse to accept the plain literal meaning of Holy Scripture. This has always seemed to me most unfair. If the words of Holy Scripture are to be taken absolutely literally, they must, as it seems to me, teach transubstantiation gross, substantial, carnal,—not, as the advanced school would say, the real spiritual presence in the elements;—and so the author of 'The Kiss of Peace':—

"She (the Church of Rome) holds the consecrated wafer before the eyes of the simplest babe in Christ, and says, 'What is it?' The child answers in the simple language of Scripture, 'This is the Lord's Body,' and in so answering the child says in thought what the Church expresses for him in formal language, 'That there has been a conversion of the whole substance of the Bread into the substance of the Body of Christ.' Either there is this conversion *or* the simple answer of the child is false. Either there is this Transubstantiation or else the Real Objective Presence is a delusion." (p. 65.)

And so in the summary prefixed to the Essay, for which the Author was indebted to the kindness of a friend, it is said that the Roman statement respecting Transubstantiation is a "necessary corollary from our Lord's own words." But, as Mr. Taylor, in his answer to 'The Kiss of Peace,' well puts it, other passages of Scripture might be treated in the same manner.

St. Matt. v. 13: "Ye are the salt of the earth."

Is it a "necessary corollary" from this, that our Lord's disciples were transubstantiated into salt?

2 Cor. iii. 2: "Ye are our Epistle."

Is it a "necessary corollary" from these words, that the Corinthians were really in themselves one of St. Paul's Epistles?

Gal. iv. 25: "This Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia."

Is it a "necessary corollary" from these words, that Agar was changed into Mount Sinai?

It needs but to ask the questions to show the absurdity of the statement. And why is a wholly new principle to be applied to the words of institution, and why are those who reject the

absolutely literal interpretation to be charged with tampering with Scripture and justifying "in principle every Socinian or other interpretation which in turn empties every text and word of Holy Scripture of its meaning?"—See Dr. Pusey's letter to the 'Times' on Absolution, Dec. 8, 1867.

In his 'Doctrine of the Real Presence in the Fathers,' Dr. Pusey meets this argument by stating that, "in a figurative sentence, the figure must be either (1) in the thing spoken of, or (2) in that which is spoken of it, or (3) in the word by which these two are connected." He then states that, in his opinion, the figure lies in the predicate in such expressions as "I am the Door," "I am the Good Shepherd," "I am the True Vine and my Father is the Husbandman," whereas there can be, as he alleges, no figure in the words "My Body which is given for you," because they speak of a true Body which for us was nailed upon the Cross. The figure plainly is not in the word This. Neither does any figure ever lie in the word *is*. Therefore it naturally follows from these premises that there can be no figure in the expression "this is my body" (pp. 61-63). But if the reader will turn over a few pages in Dr. Pusey's volume he will find the following passage, which certainly seems contradictory to his own reasoning above.

"It is quite true that the outward elements *are a figure* of the inward substance. They bear that same relation to the body which the inward substance bears to the soul. They nourish and sustain the body, as union with Christ through the inward gift in the Holy Eucharist, the Body and blood of Christ, sustains and gives life to the soul. The question as to the elements themselves *is not whether they are a figure of His body broken and of His blood shed for us. The very action of the Holy Eucharist shows that they are.* The question so far is, whether they are figures of what is present although unseen, or of what is absent," &c. (p. 68).

Dr. Pusey, therefore, after having denied that the words "this is my body" can be understood figuratively, proceeds to maintain that the very action of the Holy Eucharist shows that the elements *are* a figure as well as something beyond. But if the elements are a figure, the words which say that they are the very thing of which they are a figure must be understood figuratively. Christ, when in person before his disciples "He took

bread and brake it, saying, Take, eat, this is my body," surely meant that whatever spiritual participation of Christ might follow upon the partaking of that bread, the element itself did represent His body. We stand before a portrait and say, "that *is* whoever the picture may represent." The figure does not lie in the thing spoken of, in the word *this*, nor in the word *is*, and yet it is evident to all that the words *must* be spoken figuratively. The portrait represents, or is a figure of, the individual.

I pass on to the question of sacrifice in the Eucharist. Mr. Mackonochie seems rather to contradict himself. He says:—

"I believe that He (Jesus Christ) sent His priests, as His Father had sent Him, to be priests in earth. I believe that by the power of this consecration, and by the continual presence which He has promised with His priests, He does now, as in heaven so in earth (here as there, although under earthly veils, Himself both priest and victim), offer in each Eucharist the same one all-sufficient sacrifice. I believe that our Eucharists are true sacrifices" (and then to qualify this statement), "not as separate and independent, not as repeated sacrifices, but because they are the continual presentation and pleading with the Father here on earth, of the same one Sacrifice once finished upon the Cross, and now presented and pleaded continually by Him in His own person in heaven—by Him, too, in a mystery on earth."

I have quoted the whole passage again so as not to run the risk of misrepresenting Mr. Mackonochie. But the first and second part do not seem to cohere together. Certainly the Holy Sacrament is a representation of the One Sacrifice once offered, but that is very different from being itself a sacrifice. The memorialists to the Archbishop of Canterbury speak of the same body which was sacrificed, and the same blood which was shed, sacramentally present being offered by the Priest. The witnesses before the Ritual Commission speak of "the Priest offering this sacrifice at the Holy Communion," and also of the sacrificing Priest offering a propitiatory sacrifice. A correspondent of Archdeacon Wordsworth, "a layman, who thinks that a great deal which the ritualists do is perfectly right, an intelligent person of the middle classes, a communicant of twenty-four years' standing," writes: "I have myself heard a clergyman preaching say that our Lord 'would presently descend on the

altar to be sacrificed again for us.'" I have no wish to make others responsible for the statement listened to by the layman, but have merely quoted it to show the extreme lengths to which some, at any rate, of that party have advanced.

Some years ago it would have been difficult to believe that the following prayer would ever have been found in a book of devotion intended for the use of members of the Church of England.

"*Collects before Holy Communion on Special Occasions.*

"*At a Funeral.*—O Lord, look graciously, we beseech Thee, upon this sacrifice, which we offer to Thee for the repose of the soul of thy servant *N.*, and grant that the medicine which Thou hast vouchsafed to provide for the healing of all living, may avail for the perfecting of the departed, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen."—'The Altar Manual,' edited by a Committee of Clergy, seventeenth thousand, G. J. Palmer.

Now is the doctrine of a sacrifice of the body and blood of our Lord sacramentally present upon the altar and offered by the Priest the doctrine of the Church of England? Be it observed that this is very distinct from the commemoration of the Sacrifice once offered, "the representation here on earth of that sacrifice which is always presented before the throne of God, until the Great High Priest shall come again."—Chancellor Massingberd in Conv. Ritual debate, June 27, 1866, 'Chron. Conv.' p. 444.

The question of Eucharistic sacrifice and the question of a localised objective presence in the elements hang together. If the latter falls the former cannot stand. If there is no presence independent of the state of mind of the communicant there can be no victim offered upon the altar. If therefore we find that our Church is careful to exclude all notion of sacrifice proper from her authorised formularies, does not that in itself go far to prove that the theory of a localised objective presence is also repudiated by her? And what is the teaching of our Church upon this point?

Certainly the doctrine of sacrifice is not found in the Homilies. Thus we read with reference to the Lord's Supper, "we must then take heed, lest, of the memory, it be made a sacrifice," and again, "herein thou needest no other man's help, no other sacri-

fice or oblation" (*i.e.*, than the one sacrifice of Christ once offered), "no sacrificing Priest, no mass, no means established by man's invention."—First part of the Sermon concerning the Sacrament, pp. 396, 399. There is no ambiguity of language here. The sacrifice is not the sacrifice of a bloody or an unbloody victim, but the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. We "offer always to God the host or sacrifice of praise by Christ, that is the fruit of the lips which confess his name."—Second part of the Sermon concerning the Sacrament, p. 402. In like terms Hooker, when arguing for the retention of the word Priest as applicable to the minister of the Gospel, thus writes: "Seeing then that sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry, how should the name of Priesthood be thereunto rightly applied? Surely even as St. Paul applieth the name of flesh unto that very substance of fishes which hath a proportionable correspondence to flesh, although it be in nature another thing. Whereupon when philosophers will speak warily they make a difference between flesh in one sort of living creatures, and that other substance in the rest which hath but a kind of analogy to flesh: the Apostle contrariwise having matter of great importance whereof to speak nameth indifferently both flesh. The Fathers of the Church of Christ with like security of speech call usually the ministry of the Gospel *Priesthood* in regard of that which the Gospel hath *proportionable* to ancient sacrifices, namely the Communion of the blessed Body and Blood of Christ, although it have properly now no sacrifice. As for the people when they hear the name it draweth no more *their minds to* any cogitation of sacrifice, than the name of a senator or of an alderman causeth them to think upon old age or to imagine that every one so termed must needs be ancient, because years were respected in the first nomination of both."—Hooker, Book v. ch. 78.

But, perhaps Hooker's testimony on this point would be repudiated just as his testimony against the objective presence has been laid aside. "The truth is," writes Keble, "if one may venture to say it of one so wise, holy, and venerable, that on this subject" (the mode of presence) "as on the Apostolical succession *and some others*, Hooker was biassed by his respect for Calvin and some of his school in whose opinions he had been educated, and by sympathy with the most suffering portion of

the foreign Reformers so as instinctively and unconsciously to hide his eyes from the unquestionable consent of antiquity, and to make allowances which, logically carried out, would lead to conclusions such as the ancient Church never could have endured."—Keble 'On Euch. Ad.,' pp. 137, 138.

But after all the main question is whether in the Order for the administration of the Holy Communion we find the doctrine of a sacrificing Priesthood. And in order to ascertain this it is necessary to examine a little in detail the changes that were made in the successive revisions of the Prayer-book. A careful examination will show how scrupulous our Reformers were in excluding from the finally revised Book of Common Prayer all such notions.

Mr. Bennett speaks of the term "mass" as the "word common to us all."

On the other hand, whereas in the Prayer-book of 1549 the title of the Service for the Holy Communion ran thus:—"The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called the mass," it was altered as follows in 1552, and the alteration retained both in 1559 and 1662 (with the exception of the substitution of the word *of* for *for*). "The order *for* the administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion." It is moreover very instructive to observe the care with which the word altar was removed from the service and the word table substituted for it. Witness the following alterations:—

1549.	1552.	1559.	1662.
The Priest standing humbly afore the midst of the altar shall say the Lord's Prayer, &c.	And the Priest standing at the north side of the table, &c.	The same.	The same.
Rubric after the Offertory.			
Then shall the Minister take so much bread and wine as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the holy communion, laying the bread upon the corporas, or else in the paten, or in some other comely thing prepared for that purpose; and putting the wine into the chalice, or else in some fair or convenient cup prepared for that use (if the chalice will not serve) putting thereto a little pure and clean water, and setting both the bread and wine upon the altar, &c.	Omitted.	Omitted.	And when there is a Communion, the Priest shall then place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient, &c.
Before the Prayer for the Church Militant.			
Then the Priest turning him to the altar shall say or sing plainly and distinctly this prayer following.	The Priest shall say.	The same.	The same

1549.	1552.	1559.	1662.
After the Consecration Prayer.			
These words, before rehearsed, are to be said, turning still to the altar without any elevation or showing the sacrament to the people.	Omitted.	Omitted.	Omitted.
At the end of the Service.			
And though there be none to communicate with the Priest, yet these days (after the Litany ended) the Priest shall put upon him a plain albe or surplice with a cope, and say all things at the altar (appointed to be said at the celebration of the Lord's Supper), until after the offertory, &c.	Upon the holy days, if there be no communion, shall be said all that is appointed at the communion until the end of the Homily, concluding with the general prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church, &c.	The same.	Upon the Sundays and other holy days (if there be no Communion) shall be said all that is appointed at the Communion until the end of the general prayer, &c.

It will be seen by the above parallel passages that in every single case the word table was substituted for the word altar, or the paragraph in which the word occurred wholly omitted.

And with regard to the use of the word sacrifice the several editions of the Prayer-book are equally explicit. There is no mention of a victim laid upon the altar. What can be plainer than the following prayer:—

"O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee; humbly beseeching Thee, that all we, who are partakers of this holy Communion, may be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction. And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen."

"And as if to avoid all possibility of misconception this prayer, which in 1549 preceded the administration of the elements, was in 1552 and the subsequent versions placed after their reception by the communicants. Upon this Procter ('On the Book of Common Prayer,' pp. 359, 360) remarks:—"This thanksgiving was originally the conclusion of the canon; where coming after the consecration and before communion it was taken to imply an

oblation of the consecrated elements, or a material though commemorative sacrifice. In King Edward's Second Prayer-book, therefore, it was removed into a position where it can have no such meaning, but implies a strictly spiritual sacrifice of praise, and an oblation of the worshippers to the service of God."

With reference to this point there are some valuable remarks in the final judgment in the case of "Liddell *v.* Westerton."

After having referred to crosses attached to Communion Tables the judgment runs as follows:—

"The Appellants in their pleadings term these Tables 'Altars or Communion Tables,' and in the argument they have referred to two recent statutes in which the word 'Altar' is used to signify the 'Communion Table.' When the same thing is signified, it may not be of much importance by what name it is called; but the distinction between an Altar and a Communion Table is in itself essential and deeply founded in the most important difference in matters of faith between Protestants and Romanists; namely, in the different notions of the nature of the Lord's Supper which prevailed in the Roman Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation, and those which were introduced by the Reformers. By the former it was considered as a sacrifice of the body and blood of the Saviour. The Altar was the place on which the sacrifice was to be made; the elements were to be consecrated, and being so consecrated were treated as the actual body and blood of the victim. The Reformers, on the other hand, considered the Holy Communion not as a sacrifice but as a feast, to be celebrated at the Lord's Table; though as to the consecration of the elements, and the effect of this consecration, and several other points, they differed greatly amongst themselves."—Brodrick and Fremantle's 'Eccl. Judgments of the Privy Council,' pp. 144, 145. See also pp. 146-150.

And let none say that we are contending for mere words, and that charity should lead us not to make a man an offender on that score. It is not a question of words. It is a question of true or false doctrine. It is a question of the faith of our Reformed Church for three centuries, or the re-introduction of Roman error. If we, the priests of the Church of England, are priests in the sense of offering up a propitiatory sacrifice at the altar properly so called, we trench, be it said in reverence, on the prerogatives of the very Son of God, who "offered Himself

without spot to God," and by that "one offering hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." (Heb. ix. 14; x. 14.) No doubt passages may be brought forward from the Fathers in which the strongest terms are made use of—the "tremendous and unbloody sacrifice," and the like. But it must be remembered that the Fathers wrote before the doctrine of transubstantiation had been invented, and we cannot doubt, judging from qualifying passages which might be quoted on the other side from their writings, that had they been aware of the gross perversion of sacramental teaching which in after ages has overlaid the truth in the Church of Rome, they would have been more theologically precise in their language respecting the Holy Eucharist. Many persons in these days make use of the word "altar" in a popular sense, without intending to give in their adhesion to the doctrine of a sacrificing priesthood and a victim offered upon the altar.—See Harold Browne 'On the Articles,' pp. 678-704. Ed. 1865.

A few words must be added on the subject of the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist.

The Memorialists to the Archbishop of Canterbury, quoted above (p. 140), say:—

"We believe that Christ Himself, really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably, Present in the Sacrament, is therein to be adored."

In one sense I suppose that all persons who hold that Christ is spiritually present in the Holy Eucharist would assent to the above statement. And so, too, with regard to Keble's work 'On Eucharistic Adoration.' It is impossible, I think, to read that book without feeling what a loving reverence the writer shows in every line for the person of our dear Lord. Take, for example, the following words:—

"Is it not self-evident that had there been no abuse, or error, or extravagance connected with the practice, all persons believing and considering the Real Presence of our Lord in Holy Communion, in whatever manner or degree, would in the same manner or degree find it impossible not to use special worship? the inward worship, I mean, and adoration of the heart: for that of course is the main point in question; the posture and mode are secondary and variable, and may and must admit of dispensation. The simple circumstance of our Lord Christ declaring Himself especially present would, one would think, be enough

for this. Why do we bow our knees and pray on first entering the Lord's House? Why do we feel that during all our continuance there we should be, as it were, prostrating our hearts before Him? Why is it well to breathe a short prayer when we begin reading our Bibles, and still as we read to recollect ourselves, and try to go on in the spirit of prayer? And so of other holy exercises: in proportion as they bring with them the sense of His peculiar presence, what can the believer do but adore? I firmly believe that all good Christians do so, in the Holy Sacrament most especially, whatever embarrassments many of them may unhappily have been taught to feel touching the precise mode of their adoration."—Keble 'On Euch. Ad.,' pp. 1, 2.

Few would hesitate to subscribe to these words, but they really avoid the question in dispute. That question is whether Christ is to be adored in the elements themselves. The Memorialists before referred to seem to answer affirmatively, "Christ Himself really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably present in the Sacrament, is therein to be adored."

And in like manner the adoration of Christ present in the elements is clearly taught in the following extracts from devotional works of the Ritualistic party:—

"THE CONSECRATION.

"*Act of Adoration.*

"I adore Thee, O Lord Jesu, I adore Thy Body, Thy Soul and Thy Divinity, Thy Flesh and Thy Blood truly present in this Sacrament.

"O Christ Jesu, I adore Thee who wast lifted up from the earth that Thou mightest draw all unto Thee. I see Thee on the Cross with outstretched arms, as though Thou would'st embrace us. I hear Thee crying out, Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

"'Prostrate I adore Thee, Deity unseen,
Who thy glory hidest 'neath these shadows mean.
Lo! to thee surrendered my whole heart is bow'd,
Trane'd as it beholds Thee shrined within the cloud.'"

. . . . . .

—'The Altar Manual,' edited by a Committee of Clergy. 2nd part, p. 9.

Take an extract from another of their works:—

"At the words, This is my Body—This is my Blood—you must believe that the bread and wine become the Real Body and Blood, with the Soul and Godhead of Jesus Christ; bow down your head and body in deepest adoration, when the Priest says these awful words, and worship your Saviour then verily and indeed present in his Altar."—'The Littleo Prayer Book,' revised by three Priests. London: Palmer. p. 18.

Again, "And now, O Jesus, Thou art really coming to visit us. Thou art really coming to Thy Altar. Thou art really going to be offered up in sacrifice to the Father for my sins. . . . .

"*Rubric.*—Now kneel upright with your hands clasped upon your heart; follow the Priest in silent awe; for Jesus thy God is very nigh thee. He is about to descend upon the Altar surrounded by the fire of the Holy Ghost and attended by His angels.

"At the Consecration and elevation. Prostrate yourself in the dust, and say,—Hail! Body of my God. Hail! Body of my Redeemer, I adore, I adore, I adore Thee.

"At the consecration and elevation of the Blood, prostrate on the ground again; salute the Blood that redeemed you, saying, Blood of Jesus, I worship Thee, Blood of my Redeemer, I adore Thee."—From a 'Manual of Devotions and Directions for Members of the Church of England, when attending the service of the divine Liturgy without communicating. Intended especially for the young.'—Cleaver.

Once more:—"Bread made Flesh by the Omnipotence of the Word have mercy upon us!" is recommended as a Prayer for Communicants.—Litany of the most Holy Sacrament. 'Little Prayer Book,' p. 23.

So too Mr. Bennett writes, as he always does, plainly and unmistakeably:—

"Seeing that I am one of those who burn lighted candles at the altar in the day-time, who use incense at the Holy Sacrifice, who use the Eucharistic vestments, who elevate the Blessed Sacrament, who myself adore, and teach the people to adore, the consecrated elements, believing Christ to be in them, believing that under their veil is the sacred Body and Blood of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."—'A Plea for Toleration in the

Church of England,' &c., by W. J. E. Bennett, M.A., Vicar of Frome Selwood,* p. 14 (misprinted in the pamphlet 41).

Now, I think it is impossible, however subtilly controversial writers may argue upon the point, to avoid coming to the conclusion that by the framers of the above devotional extracts and statements the elements themselves, as containing or being Christ, were to be adored. On this point our Church has spoken with no uncertain voice in the rubric at the end of the Communion Service:—

"Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy Receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue;) yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved; It is hereby declared, That thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one."

The history of this declaration concerning kneeling is well known. It was added in 1552, omitted in 1559, and restored in 1662 with one important alteration.

---

* Since the above was written, the following letter from Mr. Bennett has appeared in the 'Church Times:'—

"SIR,—Two passages in my pamphlet, entitled 'Plea for Toleration,' have caused some perplexity, if not misgiving, to many of our friends. At the suggestion of one whom all revere, I am about to correct these phrases in a third edition now in the press. Meanwhile will you allow me, through your columns, to say that in the coming edition the word 'visible,' at p. 3, will be corrected into 'Presence of our Lord under the form of Bread and Wine'? And at p. 14, instead of 'Consecrated Elements,' the formula will be found thus—after word Adore, 'Christ present in the Sacrament under the form of Bread and Wine.'

"I am, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"W. J. E. BENNETT."

The sentence which in 1552 ran thus:—"We do declare that it is not meant thereby, that any adoration is done or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or to any *real and essential presence* there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood," was changed to:—"It is hereby declared that thereby no adoration is intended or ought to be done either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto *any Corporal Presence* of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood."

This change of words, whatever it may imply with reference to the real presence, certainly forbids any adoration of the elements, belief in any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood, or any adoration of the same in the elements. Compare these words with the extracts given above, and it is impossible to avoid coming to the conclusion that both in letter and in spirit our Liturgy pronounces definitively against them. Neither the elements nor Christ's body in the elements are to be adored, for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.

And now it is time to draw these remarks to a close. What I have said has been, I hope, urged in a spirit of brotherly candour and charity. Hard names convince no one. Motives I do not impute, but taking the statements of the more advanced leaders of the Ritualists, I do think that an honest interpretation of our Liturgical services compared with the other authorised writings of the Church of England, shows that they are more suited to foreign lands than our own England—England, whose soil has been stained by the blood of martyrs for the pure truth of God. It may be that even now troublous times are in store for the Church in this land. It may be that the time is drawing near when doctrines which ere now have been made the Shibboleths of party strife will once more be the touchstone of the Reformed Faith. It may be that around the very altar of our God, as of old, the opposing forces in the contest for truth may find themselves face to face. It may be that a struggle for the very existence of the pure and Reformed Church of Christ in these lands is nigh—even at the doors. God grant that it may not be so! But the horizon is so black with clouds that it is almost impossible to believe that they will disperse without bursting in a storm upon us. It is not only in one

point or another that our faith is assailed. The enemy attacks us on all sides, and attempts from every quarter of the compass to breach the walls which separate between us and Rome. We have now, as the Jews of old in building their Jerusalem, while we work with one hand, with the other to hold a weapon. The old armour which was thought to have served its purpose has to be furbished up again. We cannot now sit every man under his vine and under his fig-tree, none making us afraid. Indifference plays into the enemy's hand. If the watchman sleep the citadel is soon forced. Lukewarmness is nothing less than the betrayal of the faith of our fathers. It may be that even we in this generation may see the old land-marks removed, and the days of violence and persecution dawn upon us. If so may God Himself give to His ministers grace in their very inmost hearts to feel His abiding Presence with them, comforting them and guiding them into all truth, and amid the clash of the contending forces may He who prayed for the Unity of His Church on earth arise with outstretched hands and say, Peace, be still! and immediately there shall be a great calm.

A Prayer for Unity.

O God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, our only Saviour, the Prince of Peace; Give us grace seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions. Take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly Union and Concord; that, as there is but one Body, and one Spirit, and one Hope of our Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all, so we may henceforth be all of one heart, and of one soul, united in one holy bond of Truth and Peace, of Faith and Charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify Thee; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

GEORGE HENRY SUMNER.

ESSAY VI.

SCRIPTURE AND RITUAL

By T. D. BERNARD, M.A.,

Rector of Walcot and Canon of Wells.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

SUBJECT.—What principles of Ritual does the Bible give to the Church?

I.—The alleged principle, that "the Temple ritual is the directory for the Church."

1. Because "it represents the worship of heaven." An assumption—not suggested, not supported—sets aside the inspired interpretation. Futility of the appeal to "the Apocalyptic model."

2. Because "God ordained it, and never revoked it." Examination of this argument as presented in the Bishop of Vermont's 'Law of Ritual.' No abrogating legislation in the Bible. Organic growth of revelation. Temporary function of the Temple ritual. Its continuance in the Church an impossible idea to the first Christians. The Epistle to the Hebrews proves that it was unknown.

The alleged principle negatived by the Bible.

II.—The Bible yields only general principles for the guidance of the Church in the matter of Ritual. 1. Liberty. 2. Order and Fitness. 3. Edification. 4. Restriction. The Reformation of the English Ritual ruled by these principles.

The right and duty of revising it, as historically developed:—1. Under associations of heathenism; 2. Under corruptions of doctrine. Conservative spirit of Anglican Protestantism the strongest condemnation of a retrograde movement.

SCRIPTURE AND RITUAL.

We are now in full view of an organised and outspoken effort to change the received ritual of the English Church, and restore to it an aspect which ten generations have not seen. It is part of a doctrinal movement which aims at more vital change; and the most effective part, since it attracts, through natural tastes or the sensational temper of the day, allies whom no previous doctrinal sympathies would have secured, and is directed against a position, the occupation of which would be, not only the removal of a present barrier, but the acquisition of a strong basis for further advance. It would, indeed, be an inconceivable simplicity which could now regard the ritualistic movement as ending in outward and visible change, but even when so regarded it is seen to tend distinctly to the disruption of the Church.

The matter is already carried into the two courts of Law and Opinion. The former may decide for the present, but the latter will decide in the end; for the sense of the Church when sufficiently formed and ascertained will have its way, and either by fresh legislation, or by interpretations put upon existing statutes, the Law will infallibly yield to Opinion.

There are, then, two distinct questions—the one, What is the law of the Church of England in regard to the particular changes proposed?—the other, What are the principles which should govern ritual, and shape the laws which regulate it? This Essay will have regard only to the latter inquiry (ultimately the more important of the two), and will deal only with one of its many branches (but that also the most important of them all).

On the principles which should govern the form and order of worship the first authority is that of the Bible. To the Bible accordingly appeal is made; and principles alleged to be scriptural are laid before us.

We have to consider (I.) whether *these* principles, and (II.) if not these, *what* principles, are really supplied by the Written Word.

I. It is certain that the Bible contains one, and only one scheme of ritual; and if this be the general directory for Christian worship, we have but to adhere to it as closely as subsequent changes allow. It is alleged that this is the fact, that the Mosaic ordinances remain in force, and that the divinely given ritual of the Tabernacle is the perpetual directory for the Church. This view of the case is supported by two arguments, one derived from the supposed nature of the ritual, which would be an irresistible recommendation of its use: the other consisting in the divine enactment, which would be an absolute obligation for its observance.

1. The Temple ritual, it is said, must be the permanent form of worship, because it is the representation of the worship of heaven, the highest of which we can conceive, and that which we hope to share. Moses made all things according to the pattern showed him in the mount. That pattern was the heavenly worship which for that purpose he was admitted to see; so that the Temple and its ceremonial was an earthly copy of the same things in the world of glory: and this is confirmed by the Apocalypse, which shows us the heavenly worship itself marked by the same features of scenic ritual.

This argument rests on an assumption which the words of Scripture neither suggest nor support. It is said to Moses, "Let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them; according to all that I show thee after the pattern of the Tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof." And when the description of these objects has been laid before him, it is added, "And look that thou make all things according to the pattern which was showed thee in the mount." (Exod. xxv. 8, 9, 40). The things to be made are the holy tent and its mystic furniture;—the end is the creation of "a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them." What is there here about the worship of heaven? There is no intimation that Moses saw it; much less that he was directed to copy it. No word is spoken by God to him, or by him to Israel, representing the ritual under that character; nor is there the suggestion of such a character in the ritual itself which presents the divine provisions for sanctification, access, and communion, as meeting an actual state of defilement, separation, and exclusion—a state

too truly felt on earth, but never in any human imagination attributed to heaven. The Tabernacle, its furniture and ceremonial, were "shadows of heavenly things:" but what those things were is plain from the divine announcement of the end in view: "a sanctuary that I may dwell among them." The substance which cast these shadows was that predestined scheme of provisions by which God should dwell among men on terms of covenant and communion. None can guess what Moses saw of the heavenly things themselves, while tracing with careful obedient hand the outline of the shadows which they projected before him. If any such illumination was given him, it was certainly the same as that long afterwards bestowed by the Holy Ghost, disclosing in the typical arrangements of the Tabernacle, not the fashion of angelic worship, but the scheme of the relations of man to God in Christ. The Word, which in Exodus records the ordinances, in the Epistle to the Hebrews interprets them: and they are not to be heard, who found a principle of ritual on a character, which they have themselves devised for those ordinances, to which the divine interpretation does not point, which the things interpreted will not bear, and which obscures the character which the Holy Ghost has really assigned to them.

As to the argument from the Apocalypse, can it be serious? We ought, they say, to have altars, incense, and lights in our churches, because, when heaven is opened to us in the Apocalypse, we see that such things are used in worship there. And this "argument" does not float before us in that tremulous haze of poetry which seems its natural veil, but is constantly coming forward into full daylight, as if it were good substantial reasoning; and even the Royal Commission had to listen to a clergyman who professed four times in the course of his examination an obligation to conform in matter of ritual to "the Church of the Apocalypse," * and (in regard to the use of incense) "could scarcely imagine the Church falling away from the model of the Apocalypse."

Now if the great Vision of the New Testament is to be taken as a ritual directory, there ought to be not only an altar, but an ark of the covenant, and a sea of glass; and if incense is to be

* Minutes of Examination of Rev. G. Nugee.

used, so should also golden vials full of odours; and if the lamps of fire are to be represented, so should also the throne before which they burn, with the emerald rainbow arching over it; and thus the most advanced churches will have to be constructed and furnished afresh. But does any man regard the visionary emblems as material realities? or suppose that the Eternal Son appears under the mystic form there described, or the Spirit of God as lamps of fire, or that souls are really kept under an altar, or prayers in golden vials? And if not, where is the right to make an arbitrary selection from the accessories of the scene, and talk of them as if they were realities of another kind from all by which they are surrounded? In "the Book of the Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him" we are in a vast world of emblem, where all things sacred, solemn, and mystic, which the Church had ever known, all things rich, glorious, and terrible, which the world had ever seen, throng and mingle, change and dissolve before us; where all the types of the Old Testament reappear in glory, and all the visions of the old Prophets flash again across our view, and where, in the boundless wealth of imagery, every truth is expressed in symbol, and every fact in visionary scene. For men to look upon this world of emblems, and then, disregarding its manifest character and all the analogy of Scripture, to tell us that we ought to copy "the Church of the Apocalypse," and build altars, and light candles, and burn incense, because such things are "used in the worship of heaven," is, in the true sense of the word, an impertinence which the sorest need of an argument cannot be allowed to excuse.

2. But the principle that the Mosaic ceremonial is still the law of Christian ritual, professes to rest on a more solid foundation than this. When inferences from its supposed character have been dismissed, the obligation from its certain enactment remains. "That which God has enacted God alone can repeal. No revocation of this ordinance can be shown, therefore it is still in force." Certainly this is not an argument to be used heedlessly: its weight is decisive, and its consequences are immense. Often pressed upon us by eager voices, it has lately been deliberately urged by one who could be heard only with respect. Bishop Hopkins of Vermont, Presiding Bishop of the

Episcopal Church in the United States, died soon after his return from the Anglican Synod, and was buried with more than common manifestations of public reverence. His last publication was a little book on the 'Law of Ritual,' addressed to his own Clergy, but gladly welcomed here by those whose cause it assists. The President and Council of the English Church Union have done their best to diffuse it, presenting their compliments and the book to many who might not otherwise have seen it. It is a great comfort to have an argument presented from a quarter which offers no temptation to fasten upon anything but the reasoning itself. In the present case, when held up in a clear light and by a quiet hand, we can better see the looseness of the texture, and the poorness of the stuff.

The conclusion to be reached is that the Temple ritual is, by Divine ordinance, the model for the form and order of Christian worship; and the argument employed is that the Ceremonial Law was given by God, and, having never been revoked by His authority, is therefore still in force. "The common error" that "the whole of the system was entirely done away by Apostolic authority under the guidance of the Holy Spirit," is "examined," and, "if I do not much deceive myself," says the writer, "it can be thoroughly dispelled from every mind which is candid enough to be open to conviction" (p. 8). A mind need not be pre-eminently candid in order to be convinced of what the Bishop undertakes to prove, but it must be very open indeed to conviction if it is convinced of what he imagines that he is proving: for he who has shown that the Apostles did not abrogate the law, is still far from having proved that it is now in force.

But even those docile persons who will stand at any point of view at which their guide may place them, and who therefore will not perceive that the whole plan of the Bishop's argument is a mistake, will yet be sensible of two things: first, that its success would be embarrassing in the extreme; and secondly, that, after the first link or two, its chain is broken.

The Apostles, then, were not commissioned to abrogate the Ceremonial Law; for, first, no such abrogation can be shown: and, secondly, they themselves "walked orderly and kept the law," as is proved by their continued attendance on the Temple

worship, and in the case even of St. Paul, by his circumcision of Timothy and his own participation in the ceremonies of vows and appointed offerings. It is therefore an "error" to suppose that the law was abrogated; and consequently that its divine obligation is gone.

Plainly this doctrine of unabrogated law is bringing down on those who call it to their assistance much more than they desire. The thing wanted is to secure the divine authority of the Temple ritual for a certain modified imitation of it, for a Christian system of priesthood and sacrifice with lights, incense, splendid vestments and scenic ceremonial. But no one wants to have this ritual limited to a single spot, or this priesthood to a single family, or to restore the distinctions of meats, or to "circumcise their children, and walk after the customs." Some of these particulars are indeed represented as subjected to a change, though allusion to legislation in regard to them is prudently withheld.

"Of course," it is said, "the limitation of the priesthood to the posterity of Aaron was to pass away into the larger and nobler priesthood intended for the whole world. The animal sacrifices would also cease, because they were only types of the great Sacrifice which the Cross of Christ had fulfilled. And He had Himself instituted the new memorial of His precious Body and Blood in the Sacrament of the holy Eucharist: while the other Sacrament of Baptism in the name of the Trinity was also appointed after His resurrection. But," the writer continues, "*was the rest of the divine system to be abrogated?*"

Now, if "the rest of the divine system" is with these exceptions the whole of it, who will not tremble in view of the mass of Jewish observances which this doctrine is riveting upon us? Nor can we diminish it even by the Bishop's exceptions: for where is the Apostolic legislation which changes the succession of the priesthood, or abolishes animal sacrifices, or annuls the rite of circumcision? On the principle which this book maintains, such legislation must be shown; for there is no reason, in the nature of things, why the Lamb, which foreshadowed the Eternal Sacrifice, should not still commemorate it, or why other Christians, as well as Timothy, should not (as the Judaizers insisted) be both circumcised and baptised. And it is observable that the acts adduced to prove the continuance of the law, must,

in that case, prove the continuance of these very parts of it, for no one can suppose that the attendance in the Temple, and St. Paul's participation in animal sacrifices, and his circumcision of Timothy, testify the Apostolic judgment that the Ceremonial Law in general was not abrogated, but that these particular features of it were so.

It must be a relief to those who realise what this argument involves to find that its chain has broken before it reaches to themselves. The Bishop's reasoning may look successful while it keeps within the limits of Israel, but how to cross the frontier and transfer its conclusions to the Catholic Church it knows not. Hebrew Christian Churches appear to be still bound; but what of Gentile Churches? They are "grafted on the stock of Israel;" but the Scripture, by every testimony of historic fact and doctrinal assertion, declares their freedom from the Ceremonial Law. This is admitted and then made the least of. The energetic denunciations of St. Paul to the Galatians are reduced to a warning, not against their adopting the Jewish ceremonial, but against their submitting to it "as necessary to salvation:" while the doctrine of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that the system of the Old Covenant is superseded, is treated in a manner that is really curious. The two Covenants (so runs the argument) which are meant in the Epistle, are the Covenant of Works, given to Adam in Paradise, and republished at Sinai, being the moral law of the Ten Commandments, with the condition, "The man that doeth these things shall live by them:" and the Covenant of Grace, instituted after the Fall, to which the whole ritual of the Mosaic system in its typical character belonged. It was the former of these which was "made old and ready to vanish away," and the latter which was to remain, the ritual by inference remaining with it. The author appears to have been much pleased with the singular metamorphosis of an argument which reviews in detail the shadowy rites then fading from their place in the Church, identifies them in the plainest terms with that "first Covenant" from which he wishes to sever them, and shows them destined from the first to that natural extinction from which he is determined to exempt them. But the Scripture cannot be broken, and it still remains written, that "*the first Covenant had the ordinances of divine service and the worldly sanctuary,*"

and the sacrifices and the priesthood, and that this was the Covenant which God by his own Word had "made old" and doomed to "vanish away."*

These forced constructions put upon the Apostolic arguments are however still insufficient, and the author does not show us *how* he transfers the ritual of Israel with the authority of an unrevoked law into the system of the Catholic Church.

The fact is that this whole scheme of argument is one continuous mistake. The Bishop would disprove "the common error" that the Apostles abrogated the Ceremonial Law; and he does this *by adopting it himself:* only with this difference, that while some think that they abrogated the whole of it, he thinks that they abrogated some of it, namely, the local limitation of the ritual, the genealogical limitation of the priesthood, animal sacrifices and circumcision; and that "the rest," being unrepealed, remains in force. It is all fancy. There are no repealing statutes in the divine economy. He who demands them, or supposes them, shows himself (to say the least) inattentive to the method of revelation. The Koran, in the span of time which it covers, enacts laws and revokes them: not so the Bible. There is another method there, the method of organic growth—of progressive life—the method which we see in nature. The predestined plan advances: one stage of revelation breaks into another, and in so doing proves what its function was; and the function ceases because its fulfilment is no longer possible. Thus the New Covenant emerges from the Old, and presents a fresh form of life. The Church forms itself within the circle of Judaism, gradually breaks beyond it, gradually detaches itself from it. It is a process of the utmost delicacy, involving difficulties at the moment which might have left injuries for all time. Therefore, in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, we are permitted to see it completed: and what is the method pursued? Not one of legislation, but (as we may say) of history: one thing leads naturally to another. The course of events goes forward, under a divine government always felt and at critical moments shown. A vision, an angel's visit, a perceptible illapse of the Holy Ghost, the call of a new messenger, some token of the Lord's approval—interventions

* Hebr. viii. 13, ix. 1, 2, &c.

like these mingle with the course of human thought and action, just enough to modify or authorise the direction which it takes, and to counteract the influences which might have interfered with the development of the truth. No positive enactments abrogate, perpetuate, or adapt the system of the Old Covenant; but when all is done we see it lying before us an empty forsaken shell, having no further function in the history of that glorious life, which was prepared and nursed within it. And this is shown to have been the purpose fixed from the beginning, manifested by its own typical aspect and asserted by direct words of prophecy. There it lies, as we close the canonical record, "made old and ready to vanish away"—(*παλαιούμενον, γηράσκον, ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ*). The final disappearance is just deferred to give time for the clear discovery that a constitution of things in its own nature provisional, preliminary, prophetic, has been, not abrogated by a repealing statute, but antiquated by its own fulfilment.

If this be so, the principle of the authority of unabrogated law is, for the object for which it is invoked, a thing out of place and not to the purpose, and arguments built upon it have no foundation.

But though the desired conclusion cannot be reached by means of a premiss which has no soundness in it, that is no reason why it may not be established by a juster method, and one in accordance with that view of the course of revelation which has now been given. If the outward fashion of the typical Covenant has been antiquated by the hand of God, it may be that a certain part of it was perpetuated by the same hand, and that the Temple ritual has been transferred to the assemblies of the Christian Church. Certainly this would seem at first sight unlikely, because the Temple ritual was the most evidently typical and prophetical part of a system which has disappeared *because* it was typical and prophetical; and, secondly, because the dissolution of this part of the system seemed to be *specially* provided for, God having first limited it to Jerusalem, and then desolated Jerusalem, and so rendered its observance ever since impossible.

Still it may be said,—He rendered it impossible there because he had authorised it everywhere. The model was broken because the copies had been taken.

The theory is admissible, but, to give it any claim to acceptance two things are necessary, or at least one of the two.

It must be shown that such a transference was *natural, i.e.* that it was historically prepared by circumstances and habits of thought, and that thus the divine government had provided that it should take place as a thing of course. But this cannot be shown, the state of the case being exactly the reverse. What difficulty there would have been in the apprehension of such a principle, what questions would have arisen, what positive instructions would have been needed in regard to it, will be apparent to any one who has distinctly before his mind the position which the Temple worship was understood to occupy in the Jewish system, not as (what we should call) the model for public worship, but as the solitary central ceremonial for the entire nation. The ritual was that of a great sacerdotal sacrificial system, and that system was confined to a single spot. To reproduce it elsewhere would have been not more criminal than absurd, implying that the acts done in the Temple had not fulfilled the office for which the Law had created them, as effectual rites of the Covenant, but were mere ceremonies to assist the devotion of the congregation on the spot, and which therefore, for the same purpose, might be adopted anywhere, and multiplied by any number of copies. It is certain that no idea could have been more foreign to the Hebrew mind, which has proved, by abiding for 1800 years without a priest and without a sacrifice, how well it understood that the single solitary character of the Temple ritual was of its very essence, and that even if suspended in its appointed place it could never be transferred to another. Suppose that this had not been so—that the synagogues had had their altars, sacrifices, priests, and humbler reproductions of the Temple ritual, then of course these things, or things analogous to them, would have spontaneously appeared in the first assemblies of the Church (which were but Christian synagogues), and its public worship would have been constituted on the principle now contended for, that the Temple ritual in its essential features was the divine model for Christian worship. But if the contrary of all this was the case (and nothing is more certain than that it was so), then it must be supposed that a principle of worship hitherto inconceivable, for which no historical

preparation had been made, was adopted in the Church without any revelation to affirm it, or a word of authority to suggest it.*

One other support for the theory in question might yet be found, and, if found, would be sufficient. Though it might be true that the principle rested on no extant legislation, and was contrary to the habits of thought which the law of God had formed, there might still be evidence that it had in fact been understood and accepted by those whom the Apostles taught. According to the plan on which the Scriptures are written, such evidence might be dropped incidentally, or might even be wrung out for us by circumstances. Now, not only would such incidental evidence have naturally occurred in the numerous references to Christian assemblies and in the instructions of the Pastoral Epistles, but it happens that circumstances did arise which must have wrung it out, if it had been forthcoming at all.

It had been strange if the New Testament had contained no distinct treatment of the divinely instituted ceremonial of the first covenant. The relations of the typical to the true Covenant was an intricate subject requiring the teaching of God: more than this, it was a practical and pressing subject, involving the most harassing anxieties, the most distressing conflicts, which can arise in the region of serious thought. These were felt in all their force,—at last in all their anguish,—in the heart of the

* The Lord has left one definite *dictum* on the subject of worship; and it bears on the present question more closely than appears in the common treatment of the words. It is as if any one should judge of an opinion of Counsel without consideration of the case submitted. The Lord is consulted as to the place of worship; not certainly of any worship, for no Jew supposed that prayer and praise could be offered only in Jerusalem, nor any Samaritan that they could be offered only on "that mountain." It was well known that they not only could be but actually were offered in every synagogue and every house, and that they ought to be offered in sincerity of heart. But there was in Jerusalem a certain kind of worship which was found nowhere else, and the virtue of which was diffused through the whole communion. Concerning *this* worship the inquirer asks. Observe the reply: "The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet in Jerusalem, worship the Father." Had the next words been, as they seemed about to be, a declaration that in every place men should worship Him, the inference might have been suggested, that the same kind of worship which was then known to be local was now to become catholic, and that the ritual of the Temple was to be reproduced in Christian assemblies. But the well-known words employed avoid such an implication, and fix the mind not on an extension of the ritual in regard to locality, but on an elevation of the character of worship from its dependence on material and typical rites into a region of "spirit" and of "truth"—which is fulfilled (not merely by the sincerity and fervour of worshippers) but by the fact that they worship "in Christ."

Hebrew Churches. Not immediately on embracing the faith of Christ would Jewish believers understand their relation to the past. At first they would not know that it *was* the past, for they were still sharers in the old ritual—Jews at the same time that they were Christians—and many of them must have felt that words uttered by their most enlightened teachers, which (to Jews who believed not) sounded as "blasphemous words against the Holy Place and the Law," were at least perplexing words to them. But time went on, and the question obtained from the progress of thought a shape which all were compelled to recognise, and from the course of events a pressure which all were compelled to feel. To persons who at last saw whither their new faith was leading them, and that, if they adhered to the Lord Jesus, they must "go forth to him without the camp" stripped of inherited habits and thrust out from dear associations, whose minds were shaken to the centre, and who were in danger of apostacy itself, the Epistle to the Hebrews was written. One who sees distinctly the subject of which he treats, surveying all the range of it and penetrating to all its depths, addresses those whose "dulness of hearing" he deplores, and whose consequent danger at this crisis of their faith he realises with intense sympathy, pain, and fear. In his magnificent exposition of the bearing of the Old Covenant on the New, he seizes and uses every argument which in its rapid progress it suggests, for assisting the endangered believers to "hold fast the profession of their faith without wavering."

But there is one argument which is not there; though the course of the discussions seems to thrust it on the writer, and to the state of mind addressed it would have been telling in the extreme. It is that of the perpetuation of the Temple ritual in the ordinances of the Christian Church. Accustomed to a visible transaction on earth of the effectual rites of the Old Covenant, many of the Hebrew Christians had too feebly apprehended the full realisation of them in Christ to acquiesce without strong reluctance in a final severance from that system. Their feelings might have expressed themselves in the passionate language of distress, which on this subject is now heard among ourselves.* How would the writer have met the wants of the

* *E.g.* "If we have copied the Synagogue, two things follow. We have adopted one kind of Jewish worship instead of another—the Synagogue

moment if he could have cried, "those Ordinances are not only as types realised in Heaven, but as rites continued on earth. You have them still with all their divine authority. In your own assemblies true Priests offer the true sacrifice, and what the Temple was under the old system, that every Christian Church is under the new." Had this principle been understood, it is morally impossible that it should not have been referred to. Had it not been understood, there was now the last necessity to make it clear, both to meet the desperate exigency of the moment, and to establish a great practical truth for ever. But *it is not there.* The sacrificial system, the sacerdotal ministries, the Ordinances of Divine Service, and the worldly sanctuary are presented as shadows of the "one sacrifice offered once for all," of the one Priest who "hath his Priesthood unchangeable," and of His ministry "in Heaven itself." These heavenly things "are come," and their shadows are disappearing, ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ. Not a hint occurs that these mystic outlines will yet linger on the walls, diverting the eye of faith which should rest on the realities alone; not an intimation that, as transactions on earth, these Ordinances are still continued, and diffused through all the Churches of the Saints. The analogy of the earthly Covenant in the point of its having but *one* Temple is not corrected, but maintained. That great feature appears as typical as any other. Synagogues in the farthest regions of the Dispersion had turned towards Jerusalem as if parts of the courts of its Temple, conscious of connexion with the home and centre of the Covenant, and sharing in the rites which were there effectual, but which it was not for them to reproduce. So stand the Christian Churches round their common centre, "the Sanctuary and true Tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man," where the one sacrifice prolongs its inexhaustible efficacy from age to age and the one Priest is "a Priest for ever." As in so many courts surrounding that one Temple, the holy assemblies meet, to testify their living communion with its

---

instead of the Temple. We have lost the divinely-appointed sacrificial system carried on by the Temple worship, and have got only the humanly-appointed system established by tradition in the Synagogue. We are then without a Priest, without an Altar, without Sacrifice—in a condition of slavery and degradation. . . . . And this is what has come upon us by the preaching of the glorious gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ!"—*Tracts for the Day.* '*The Rule of Worship,*' p. 8.

transactions, to eat from its altar,* and to join in its accepted sacrifices of adoration and praise.

Thus within the Canon of Scripture there is no knowledge of the theory that the Temple ritual is continued in the forms of Christian worship. God by law and government under the Old Covenant provided that it should not arise, and by the records of the New Testament has given evidence that it did not, and those who argue from this theory as a rule of ritualistic practice have adopted a principle which the Bible utterly disowns.

II. What then are the principles which the Bible gives? Principles are all that we can ask for, if what has been said be

* One solitary line in the Epistle to the Hebrews is alleged in support of the Ritualistic cause. "*We have an altar*, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the Tabernacle." (Hebr. xiii. 10.) It is plain that this may mean one or other of two things. "We have in our churches an altar such as there is in the Temple, on which, like those who minister there, we offer sacrifice, and eat from it of that which has been offered;" or, "We have in the one sacrifice on the cross that which the altar in the Temple typified, and we eat of it spiritually in the communion of the body and blood of Christ;"—*i.e.* it may bear either the Romanist or the Anglican meaning. Which it does bear must be ruled—1, by the general Apostolic doctrine on the subject; in regard to which there can be no doubt, since no other sentence can be adduced capable of bearing the meaning which it is attempted to put upon this. 2, by the character of thought and expression in the place where it occurs. *α.* It is evident that everything with which the altar is associated, the high priest, the sacrifice, the sprinkling of the blood, the holiest of all, &c., are symbolically used and placed in the one heavenly Temple: therefore the altar also must bear its symbolical meaning in the spiritual scene. *β.* The altar is not mentioned as that on which the Church offers, but from which it eats. Not the sacrifice, but that which is subsequent to the sacrifice is spoken of, the act of communion wherein "they who ate of the sacrifice were partakers with the altar." *γ.* The form of expression is suggestive, "they have no right to eat which serve the *Tabernacle*," τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες. The word points to the shadowy transient nature of the system (of which the original home was a Tabernacle) as contrasted with the realities to which we have been admitted. *δ.* In the same passage the imagery of Jewish ritual is employed, not in the materialistic, but the spiritual sense—"By him let us *offer the sacrifice* of praise to God continually—the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to His name. But to do good and to communicate forget not, for with *such sacrifices* God is well pleased."

The use which is made of this one line in the interests of Roman doctrine may lead us to observe the divine caution in the use of symbolic language. It might have been expected that the writer to the Hebrews employing their old devotional imagery, and intensely anxious to transfer the hallowed associations of the past to their true and spiritual purposes, would have used *many* expressions susceptible of perversion, and to some minds naturally suggestive of ritualistic meaning. But in all that delicate yet decisive handling of the language of type and symbol, there is scarcely one expression which for a moment can *seem* ambiguous. It is the more striking by contrast with later Christian literature in which we see an affectionate rhetoric, which loved to use the consecrated imagery of the Old Covenant, harden by degrees into settled ritual and doctrinal principles.

true. It is certain that the Bible contains but one law and scheme of ritual, and if that be not the law and model for the Church, the Bible gives to the Church neither law nor model. To a certain habit of mind this idea appears so shocking that the bare statement of it is thought proof enough of the continuance, under an altered character, of the Mosaic ritual: for if the Jews had a ritual prescribed by God and we have not, then, it is argued, a distinct mark of inferiority and degradation is set upon the higher dispensation, and the glory of the latter house is less than the glory of the former.

1. The *ground* of this argument is an error. The Jews had not, any more than we have a divine directory for public worship in general, but only for that typical system which was localised in a single spot, and which, in the Christian scheme, has its corresponding fulfilment in the single person of Christ. In their synagogues through all the world they arranged the forms of their worship by human ordinance, and the same may be said even of the acts of devotion which were by custom associated with the typical rites in the Temple itself. Thus the first ritual principle which the Bible yields, even under the Old Covenant, is that of *liberty*, in other words, the principle that the form and order of worship is a part, not of the revelation of the mind of God, but of the expression of the mind of man. And this is clearly the true account of the matter, for if the worship itself is an expression of the mind of man, still more must the manner and garb of it be so. The establishment of this character of worship is no inconsiderable result of Scripture teaching, though it may appear so to one who observes that reason establishes it also. But let him go on to observe that, though reason establishes it in argument, it has never established it in fact; but that there has been a constant tendency in all human religions to treat the words and forms of the traditional worship, even when their origin has been forgotten and their meaning has been lost, as having a mysterious virtue and a sort of divinity in themselves; to the extent as appears in some of the Vedic hymns of making them objects of adoration, worshipping the sacrifice, and praying to the prayer.*

* "The hymns comprising one whole section of the Rig-Veda are addressed to Soma, the milky juice of the moon-plant (*Asclepias acida*), which the wor-

If in Israel according to the flesh the strict limitation of the typical system compelled the spontaneous formation by the community of its own form and order of public worship, much more was this spontaneity the proper attribute of the Christian Church. Had the general forms of religion under the old dispensation been more precisely defined and authoritatively imposed than they were, the removal of such definition and imposition would not be a badge of degradation, but a mark of elevated responsibility and freedom of action, such as are proper to a stage of life represented in Scripture as one of emancipation from the prescriptions of childhood, and comparative spiritual maturity. Because the Spirit was in the Church it belonged to the Church to utter its own words and shape its own forms to the glory of God in Christ. The apparent exception was no exception, for the two Sacraments were *more* than the expression of the mind of man, and on that account a divine ordinance gave their form; but even then restricted itself to the centre and essence of the rite, and left the Church to its liberty in all circumstances with which it might illustrate, or devotions with which it might surround them. This liberty, belonging to the

---

shipper had learned to deify. This deification of the Soma is still more prominent in the Sáma-Véda."—*Hardwick, Christ and other Masters*, Pt. II. p. 14.

"The most celebrated of the prayers is the Gayatri, held to be the holiest verse in the Védas, and personified as a goddess, the wife of Brahmá. It is preceded by a mysterious monosyllable, the type of the three divinities, Brahmá, Vishnu, Siva, and the essence of the Védas—OM, and by three scarcely less sacred words, Bhur, Bhuvar, Swar, denoting earth, atmosphere, heaven. The prayer is merely 'Let us meditate on the sacred light of that divine sun, that it may illuminate our minds.'"—*H. H. Wilson, Lectures on the Religious Practices of the Hindoos*, p. 15.

The natural growth of superstitious feeling in regard to ceremonial is well-given in the following extract:—"When the father of a family was priest, poet, and king in one person, there was no thought as yet of distributing the ceremonial duties among sixteen priests, each performing his own peculiar office, or of measuring the length of every log that should be put on the fire, and determining the shape of every vessel in which libations should be offered. It was only after a long succession of sacrifices that the spontaneous acts and observances of former generations would be treasured up and established as generally binding. It was only after the true meaning of the sacrifice was lost that unmeaning ceremonies would gain that importance which they have in the eyes of priests. If a hymn addressed to the gods had been heard, if a famine had ceased after a prayer, an illness been cured with a charm, an enemy been vanquished with war songs, not only would these songs, however poor, be handed down in a family as the most precious heir-looms, but the position in which the poet recited them, the time of the day, the most minute circumstances of every act, would be superstitiously preserved in order to insure the future efficacy of the prayer. This was the origin of a ceremonial so complicated as that of the Brahmans."—*Max Müller, History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, p. 485.

Church at the beginning, has been secured for it for ever by the Providence which has avoided the introduction into the Canon, even of such mention of Apostolic usages as might seem indirectly to impose them, leaving them to reach future ages as they might, through the ordinary channels of traditional custom or historic record. Eager endeavours to extract liturgic meaning from the mention of St. Paul's cloak, or of the lights in the upper chamber, can only make us feel more strongly how carefully the reserve of the New Testament on this point has been maintained.

2. In things ecclesiastical as well as civil the complement of the principle of liberty is that of law or *order*. That principle which has "its seat in the bosom of God and its voice in the harmony of the world" has its manifestation in the holy book. Looking only to the structure of the Word and to its garb of language and expression, who does not feel that the one rises before us in order and proportion, and that the other clothes it with grandeur and grace? Doubtless a concentration of mind on certain truths, a reaction from forms which had been worn by falsehood, and the idiosyncrasy of a nation or a party, may make the love and use of Scripture co-existent (say) with the Puritan or the Quaker taste. But certainly the Bible in its structure, style, and manner, is not an exemplification of such a taste, nor would of itself beget it. Wonderful is that great monument in the freedom of its plan, the variety of its materials, and the cohering strength of its construction; in its relative proportions, manifold correspondences, and intricate harmonies more and more unfolding themselves to the studious eye: wonderful also in its vivid pictures, affluence of imagery, and rich combination of poetic elements, dramatic, lyric, and idyllic. Now the eye rests upon the bold sharp outline of truth, and just beyond loses itself in the gloom of its mysterious recesses. Here the light of Heaven falls broad and clear upon the pavement, and there streams, as through the storied pane, in the figures and colours of parable. No, certainly; it is not from the Bible that we learn to refuse to the poetic side of our nature any connection with the religious life, or to think that every appeal to taste and imagination in the forms of things is a sin against their spirit. Thus much at least we ought in mere

truthfulness to assert, for in inquiring what principles of judgment on the externals of religion we derive from Scripture, its character and effect upon the whole must be taken into account as well as its particular ordinances and distinct sayings.

Yet further it ought to be acknowledged that some of its ordinances and sayings have a present force, though they pertain to the typical system which has passed away; for if it was ordained that in the Temple and its ritual there should be a professed regard to purposes of "glory and beauty," the sanction of the principle remains, though the particular illustrations of it do not. That natural sense of fitness which suggests a proportion between the circumstances and the nature of an action, and gives a certain licence of prodigality in the offerings of love, and engrosses the expressions of loyalty in golden letters, and clothes the bride in white, and places the sovereign on a throne, and insists on the formalities of justice, must ever derive from the ordinances of the old dispensation a warrant for its continued influence in the public scenes and acts of religion.

Turning to the course of fact we find that the historic link between the Jewish and Christian worship is in the synagogue. The public worship of the Church was shaped within this framework, prepared beforehand; and we have to observe what principles of order it derived from the divine law, and at what external points it caught the light from Sion. High placed above other buildings, or with some visible mark of its sacred character, consecrated by the ceremonies with which it was opened, and secured from profane uses, a Jewish synagogue was a type of order in its internal arrangements, in the titles and duties of its officers, in its liturgic forms, and in the days and hours of its public use. Every means was taken to symbolise connexion with the Covenant, and to constitute the building, wherever situated, a court of the distant Temple. In every city and country its *Kibleh* was the same, so that all who entered it or prayed in it were looking towards Jerusalem. The further end which arrested the eye bore the title of Temple, the name appropriated to the Holy House; and the chest which stood there was called the Ark, and its lid the Mercy Seat. Embroidered veils hung before the rolls of the law, which were there not merely for the reading of

the lessons, but kept with all the state, and drawn forth with all the reverence, which were due to representative Tables of the Covenant.

These were in the providence of God the nurseries in which the Apostles who fashioned the Christian Churches, and the Jews and devout persons who first composed them, had formed their habits of common worship; and through this medium the Church inherited from the elder Covenant the general framework of liturgic order and the principles of a grave and restricted symbolism. If, for instance, a Christian house of prayer were raised on high, and distinguished by its aspect from other buildings, and consecrated to its proper uses, and turned in a significant direction; and if there were some character of symbol in its form and ornaments, and if its inmost part presented the holy table which bears visible witness of the New Covenant, and is used for its highest act of communion,* such a house would exhibit an analogy in all these respects with the external features of the synagogue. And the same may be said of the seasons of devotion observed in it, and of liturgic forms used in it, as well as of the reading, exposition, and exhortation, which were characteristic features of the synagogue service, and in reference to which the analogy is more commonly noted.

But the details of this analogy are of minor moment. If we look to that stage in the history of public worship out of which historically Christian worship rose, it is not for the sake of its particular arrangements, but of its general cast of settled order and serious dignity, resulting from the training of the divine Law and the consciousness of the divine Covenant. The revela-

* The arrangement above noticed, which obtains in our churches, carries out the Christian analogy with the synagogue, since to the Jew the ground of covenant is the possession of the law, to the Christian the participation in Christ. But let it be allowed to add a word in favour also of that customary superscription of the Decalogue, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, which is disappearing from our recently-arranged churches, sometimes to make way for ambiguous ornaments, sometimes from an impression that there is something legal and Jewish in giving such a position to the law, or else that they were placed in full view only for purposes of instruction, which is no longer necessary. A better reason for their presence in that position is that they are the testimonies of the covenant in virtue of which the Church assembles; the two Tables of the Law presenting its first stage, and the Creed and Lord's Prayer its second, in which "Faith is come," and God is "our Father," and both combined witnessing to the unity of the revelation in both its stages. There is a deeper significance in this than in a reredos of sculptured stone or mottled marble.

tion of the true Covenant would change many things, but it would not change this. A vast elevation had taken place when the worshippers knew that, what the Synagogue had been to the Temple, that their assembly was to the true Sanctuary, where the true Priest had entered and the true sacrifice had been accepted. They celebrated the acts of a spiritual communion with the voices of an enlightened faith and a joy that was full of glory. But the habit of sacred order was not less congenial to the higher worship, and had received fresh supports from the divine prayer which had been given to guide it, and the sacrament which had been ordained to crown it. Indeed it may be reverently said that this habit had received a new sanction from the indescribable dignity which invested the movements, and the singular order which appeared in the acts, of the Lord himself; and that it is, in its own degree, a part of that mind of Christ which is the law and spirit of the Church.

Of course in the first Christian assemblies temporary circumstances interfered with the natural development of this principle; so that, if we could know exactly what was done in them, we should not therefore have a complete rule for ourselves. Those who had no possession of localities, and often no assurance of safety, had to suit themselves to circumstances, and could not suit circumstances to themselves. The various elements which flowed into the Church—Jewish, Greek, Roman, Barbarian—brought each its own habit and savour with it, and only time could produce the settlement of Apostolic order and predominance of the Christian taste. The inevitable excitement attendant upon the first apprehension of new mysteries of faith, new bonds of brotherhood, and new terms with heaven, could not but often show itself in disturbing forms. Above all, the spiritual gifts, exercised under sudden impulses and strong tension of mind, seemed to claim by their character of inspiration a right to supersede all rules of taste or custom. But even to these the Apostolic government refused to concede that license, and St. Paul appeals from Corinthian fashions to the common custom of the Churches (1 Cor. xi. 16), and from the tendencies of spiritual impulse to God's eternal law of order (1 Cor. xiv. 32, 33), and closes his judgment by one of the only two distinct ritual decrees which the New Testament

contains: "Let all things be done decorously* and according to order" (1 Cor. xiv. 40), words which (as applied to a national ritual) may be almost translated by those in which Wordsworth (in days of ritual ignorance) saluted the English Church,—

> "By hands of Wisdom reared
> In beauty of holiness, with ordered pomp,
> Decent and unreproved."

3. "Let all things be done to *edifying*." (1 Cor. xiv. 26.) This is the other rule, and the higher of the two, as the life is more than the form, and the end than the method. It also is to be quoted not as a solitary saying, but as the utterance of the whole mind of Scripture. Edifying (building up) in Christ Jesus imports, not the sensible and often transient effect to which the word is commonly applied, but work that is gradual, solid, and lasting; and in the Apostolic writings it expresses the end which, in the Church of Christ, actions, ordinances, and institutions should serve. Rites and ceremonies not being imposed by divine ordinance are absolutely subject to this rule. The enunciation of it refers us at once to a higher court and more important decisions, for real edification can only be *in the truth*. Solemn impressions and tender emotions, if not in harmony with the truth, may build up into error, superstition, or idolatry, and not into Christ. Thus a ritual controversy may be essentially a doctrinal one, as is in fact the case with those now in progress. He who believes that in the Eucharist the consecrated elements are in themselves the very body and blood of Christ, and as such to be offered in sacrifice for quick and dead, and to be adored by all who behold them, must think that the Church is edified by a ritual which visibly symbolises this truth; while he who believes that the doctrine is not a truth, but a carnal perversion of divine words, the product of the idolatrous tendency in man, and injurious to the nature of the sacrament, will look upon such a ritual as not for edification but for destruction. Thus in attempts at distinct

* The word "decently," as now commonly used and understood, conveys a lower sense than the word employed by St. Paul. Such expressions as "barely decent," "common decency," &c., suggest a limitation of its meaning to that which is not shocking or scandalous, whereas the word *εὐσχημόνως* conveys the idea of something well-fashioned, honourable, and comely in its aspect. It is used twice elsewhere in the Epistles of the fair and dignified character of the Christian walk.

changes of ritual it will often be necessary to remove the question from the court of taste into that of truth, where the issue must be defined and the articles amended; and the anxiety, the watchfulness, and the resolution of faith may be justly concentrated upon details which, apart from their implications, are trifles.

But where no such definite points are involved, the principle, that all must be done to edifying, places the whole fashion and order of religion in entire subordination to the interests of the spiritual life. Proposals to impress, to dazzle, to charm the imagination, to make the senses a way to the heart, must be subjected to this decisive test. Methods for attracting those that are without must be judged by their fitness to attract them to God, and a framework for the education of devotion by its tendency to promote worship in spirit and in truth, and "object-lessons in religion" by the character of the religion which they teach.

But, while this rule is in its relation to the truth positive and inflexible, it has at the same time a certain pliancy in its relation to man, since it compels the consideration of actual capacities and habits, seeing that what would be edifying in one case would not be so in another. Symbols, for instance, which would be intelligible, and expressions of feeling which would be natural, at Constantinople in the days of Chrysostom, might not be so in England now. Ceremonies (say of commemoration of the dead or of anointings with oil), in one age savouring only of holy truths, might appear in another as surrounded with dangerous suggestions or disturbing associations, which in the mean time they had accumulated. A service, which might seem a natural language to a musically-educated people, might be to a common congregation as though celebrated in an unknown tongue. Or an order and manner fashioned by English taste and traditions might have a deadening effect in a church of Negroes or Chinese. This rule then carries with it a principle of considerateness, a character of elasticity; and yet its proper effect must be to keep a strong check upon ritual development. It cannot but create a taste at once sober and sensitive, a seriousness of purpose which will be impatient of attempts at effect, and a desire for spiritual profit which will shrink from histrionic imitations and the elaboration of artistic display.

4. But the principle of *restriction* must be separately noted as one of those which we derive from Scripture. The last mentioned principle was furnished by the end which ritual is to serve; this, by the part which it is to bear in serving it—a subordinate, a limited, a cautious part. No statute need be quoted, for on this point Scripture as a whole is a warning and a law. Even under the elder dispensation, the comparative insignificance of ritual ordinances, and the danger of giving them a false value were testified by the most energetic voices of the prophets. In the New Testament a yet stronger testimony is borne by the eloquence of persistent silence. In all those records of the formation of the Church, and those instructions of the Apostles to elders whom they ordained, and commissaries whom they employed, no definite ritual directions occur. A system of church life and worship is in action, in which all is to be done according to order, and all to be done to edifying; but we have nothing beyond outlines and principles. In its treatment of ceremonies the New Testament presents a strong contrast to all religions of human origin, and to the religion of the law, (apart from the prophetic comments). The very word (θρησκεία) which our translators have rendered "religion," implying the external habit of devotion, receives from the most characteristically Jewish of the inspired writers a moral, in opposition to a ceremonial character; his "religion" has for its sacrifices visitation of the fatherless, and for its lustrations purification from the world.

This comparative disparagement of the ceremonial side of religion arises naturally from its internal glory. The manifestation of the Eternal Word has lifted the Church from the region of the flesh into that of the spirit, creating immediate transactions with heaven, and ascertained relations with God. Veils which were thrown over that which could not be steadfastly looked upon, and signs which were used because men could not speak, are "done away in Christ," and the Church looking up with "open face" and "plainness of speech," can never again assume a characteristically ritualistic aspect, unless she should disown her calling, and "having begun in the Spirit" should seek to be "made perfect by the flesh." These retrograde tendencies, deeply seated in human nature, were soon at work, and the Scripture recognises their presence, and by strong

warnings of the danger gives emphasis to that principle of restriction in ritual which its general tone suggests. How distinctly and painfully has the subsequent history proved the need of this warning and the soundness of this principle!

Such are the leading principles given by the Scriptures on the subject of ritual; and when after fifteen centuries a day of reformation came, Churches had still these principles to guide them. One Church at least acted upon them deliberately, intelligently, and in all good faith, and has virtually laid them down as the basis of her action in that most considerate of public documents, the "Chapter on Ceremonies," in the Preface to the Prayer Book.

On these principles the changes were made which have given to the English ritual that distinctive character which it is now sought to obliterate, in order to revert to "the pre-reformation standard," and the law of "Catholic usage." The departure from that law and standard is regarded, not only as so much loss of the Church's heritage of glory and beauty, but as in some sort an injury to her life, breaking in regard to the past its continuity, and in regard to the present its unity. The case relied on appears to be this:—

Supposing that there is in Scripture no direct divine law of ritual, then it was left to the Church to make one. The Church did make one. We see it in the misty distance dim and indeterminate, but shaping and maturing itself as time goes on, till, under the full historic day, we behold it in the aspect familiar to us now in the Churches of the Roman obedience. Here then is the result, in matter of ritual, of the principles which were left to germinate in the Church; here is the visible embodiment of the Christian doctrine and development of the Christian taste; and under these circumstances the fact of its prevalence is the proof of its authority.

So it would be if it could be shown that there was nothing which could develop itself in the life of the Church, but the principles and spirit which it had received from God; or at least that there was a revelation that, in spite of other influences working within it, these should always in fact prevail. But it is certain that the visible Church included in the width of her expansion every principle, and passion, and tendency of human

nature. Even in the records of the New Testament we see the stream of Christian story troubled near its very source, and soon discoloured by all that is swept into its current from its banks, which crumble as they widen; and the student of subsequent ecclesiastical history follows with wonder the turbid and tossing river, which in bringing health and salvation to the world, absorbs the defilements of the world into itself, till it becomes "a troubled sea which cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt." He must be an imaginative theorist, and not an observer of facts, who in view of the actual history can assume that every custom which obtained general acceptance and authoritative sanction was thereby proved to be a development of the divine element in the Church's life. Rome has asserted this: the Reformation has denied it, and regarding the whole prevalent system as a mixed result of true and false principles, of divine influences and human tendencies, of the action of the Sower and of the enemy, it had recourse to the test of the Written Word. Certainly the ritual of the Church, as the most visible part of its system, was not likely to escape this test; and, as having been moulded under the free action of natural influences, had no right to escape it.

Ritual is not the worship of the Church, but the garb and manner of its worship; and, as a man's dress and manners are fashioned by his associations as well as by his principles, so ritual is the joint product of the associations and the principles of the Church. On account of both these factors it was justly subject to revision.

We are not ignorant of the associations amid which the Latin ritual was matured. The tastes and mental habits of the Roman and barbarian heathenisms did not vanish in a moment, when the populations which had been nurtured in them poured into the Church. The waning empire became Christian while still magnificent in its corruption and vast in its decay; and pomp, and circumstance, and scenic representation of holy mysteries, and bold rendering to the senses of spiritual things, were natural to the spirit of the age. But they were more than natural, they were useful, when the northern hordes swarmed over the provinces, and the Church had to conquer the conquerors. Then the intellectual childishness, the unreasoning susceptibilities, and the passionate impulses of tribes that were not yet nations,

were to be touched, and awed, and taught by any means that seemed level to their capacities or accordant with their habits; and so the outward and visible things, though not separated from nobler and holier influences, yet bore a disproportionate part in the work, a part which at first might seem serviceable, but in the end was not safe. In this process a religion essentially spiritual became characteristically ritual, and assumed an aspect foreign to its nature. Christianity, thrown hastily over half-converted multitudes, dropped its bright folds over a mass of stubborn paganism, and took the outlines of the form which it covered. How then can they be heard who tell us that a ritual fashioned among these associations is to be esteemed as an ordinance of God and a heritage for ever, which it was a sin to revise by the inspired canon? Or how can they be borne, who being members of a Church which has deliberately judged otherwise, are resolute to restore all that was cast off, though at the risk of disruption to that Church itself?

Turning to the other factor of ritual, the doctrinal principles of the Church, it may seem reasonable that the faith once delivered to the saints should confer something of its own immutability on the forms which in a certain sense express it. But has the faith itself (as actually held) been unchanged? And if developments of doctrine have taken place in the course of ages, have the erring tendencies of human nature had no share in those developments, making them liable in spite of prevalence and authority to be themselves revised by the one perpetual Rule of Faith? The Church of England, for her part, has given the answer by word and deed. She has delivered judgment that "the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith," (Art. XIX.), and in careful language has marked the specific errors, and by decisive act renounced them. Her strong expressions of reverence for antiquity and longing for unity, of value for every token of continuity, and every feature of catholicity, are now quoted by those who seek reconciliation with Rome, as invalidating the force of her protest. They do in fact increase it in the highest degree. If a man of conservative habit, in making some momentous and decided change, were to show in the very act that his mind was still open to every consideration which ought to weigh on the other side, and to every sentiment

which might justly incline him to it—who would not feel that he had given to the reasons which determined him, the strongest testimony of adhesion which it was possible for them to receive? On the same account the Protestantism of the Church of England has a weight which no other Protestantism possesses. No bitterness rejoicing to denounce, or vehemence rushing to destroy, can have the same value in the way of testimony as strong language used, and strong steps taken under the acknowledged pressure of every feeling and conviction which could rightfully plead against them. Under this influence the language *was* used, and the steps *were* taken; the doctrine of Rome, tried by the Rule of Faith, was asserted to include things "repugnant to the Word of God," "fond things vainly invented," "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

Ritual then, in so far as expressive of doctrine, was necessarily involved in the same condemnation. If developments of doctrine were vicious, then their expressions in ritual were vicious too; and even forms that were not so in themselves, might have become so implicated with hurtful associations or superstitious uses, that they could no longer be safely retained. When after so many centuries the day of necessary revision came, the long history had left materials for legislation which the early Church had not, which only time could accumulate, and which are summed up in the word *experience*. The experience was vast and sad. It would have been guilt to disregard it then. It will be guilt to disregard it now. It is well that we are spared all dispute whether the developments of ritual, which are forcing themselves back upon us, are to be regarded as expressions of doctrine or no. Everywhere (except perhaps in courts of law) eager voices proclaim that the pre-reformation standard of ritual is valued as a means to express pre-reformation doctrine, and conformity to "Catholic usage" as a step to reconciliation with Rome. By the innovators themselves the issue is defined, and the Church of England is fairly warned that the present proposal to remodel her superficial ornaments is a determined attack on her distinctive character, and an intended shock to her fundamental principles.

T. D. Bernard.

ESSAY VII.

THE CHURCH IN SOUTH AFRICA.

By ARTHUR MILLS, M.A.,

of Balliol College, Oxford.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY VII.

Brief historical sketch of the South African Church, from the first establishment of the Diocese of Capetown in 1847 to the present time.

Uniform practical results of all the decisions of the Courts in supporting the legal status of the Bishop of Natal.

Conflict of opinions as to the attitude to be taken by the Church at home in reference to the controversy.

Distinction between Free Colonies and Crown Colonies.

Reasons for maintaining Royal Supremacy as a security for truth and order in colonies which do not contain the materials for Church synods.

Royal Supremacy may be more safely exercised under a constitutional than an absolute Sovereign.

Importance on religious grounds of a Court of Appeal recognising one uniform standard. This can only be secured so long as the Colonial Church continues to be part and parcel of the National Church at home. Hopes for the future.

THE CHURCH IN SOUTH AFRICA.

THE ecclesiastical controversy which has now for nearly six years agitated the Christian Church in South Africa has been watched in England through its various phases with a sustained interest rarely bestowed on the disputes of distant communities. The exceptional earnestness with which these remote combatants have been aided and abetted by their respective partisans in this country is due, no doubt, mainly to the conviction that whatever may be the final issue of the strife, its results will react not only on ourselves at home, but on every colony and country in which a branch of the Church of England exists. In this point of view the question assumes an importance co-extensive with the limits of Anglican Christendom, and must therefore be regarded entirely apart from the local and personal associations in which it has been hitherto almost inevitably absorbed.

In its purely theological aspects the "Natal crisis" has been already more than sufficiently discussed. The debates of both Houses of Convocation, the voluminous treatises, pamphlets, letters, speeches, and newspaper articles which have exhausted every doctrinal topic raised by the writings of Bishop Colenso and the criticisms of his opponents, may be said to have left no argument untouched which could tend to illustrate the religious aspects of the controversy. With these we have on the present occasion no concern. Our question is simply what, under the existing conditions of the law, and on a review of all the facts and circumstances of the case, is our duty as Englishmen, and as Christians, in dealing with the crisis which has arisen in Natal, and which promises in one form or other to extend itself to every branch of the United Church of England and Ireland? A brief recapitulation of the facts of the case, stripped of all inferences and personalities, will perhaps best enable us to apprehend the actual position of affairs in our South African

colonies. A chronological summary of disconnected events constantly changing their scene can scarcely be otherwise than dry and uninteresting, but it would be difficult to form an accurate and impartial judgment on a question, in almost all statements of which facts and opinions have been so inconveniently interlaced, until some historical basis has been previously laid.

In 1847, the diocese of Capetown, comprising an area of about 200,000 square miles on the mainland of South Africa, and including the Island of St. Helena, about 1200 miles from its west coast, was created by Royal Letters Patent. In 1853, at the request of the Bishop (who in order to carry out the arrangement resigned his see), the diocese was subdivided, and those of Natal and Grahamstown carved out of it, that of Capetown proper being at the same time defined, and endowed with Metropolitan powers by a fresh Patent.* The *personnel* of the new episcopate as reorganised in 1853 was as follows:—Bishop Gray retained the now contracted diocese of Capetown proper, with Metropolitan powers; Bishops Armstrong and Colenso were selected by Bishop Gray for the dioceses of Grahamstown and Natal respectively. For several years from this date no public controversy appears to have disturbed the peace of the South African Church until that which arose between the Bishop of Capetown and Mr. Long.†

In May, 1862, a book written by the Bishop of Natal, entitled 'A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,' supposed to contain objectionable matter, was submitted by the Bishop of Capetown to the then Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Sumner), and a private meeting of Bishops, over which Dr. Longley, then Archbishop of York, presided. In February, 1863, another book, written also by the Bishop of Natal, and entitled 'The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua critically examined,' was submitted to a similar meeting, who thereupon resolved, That the

* These powers were, in the words of the Patent, "subject to the general superintendence and revision of the Archbishop of Canterbury."

† The Rev. William Long, incumbent of Mowbray, being commanded by the Bishop to convene a Synod in a form implying that the Church of South Africa did not form part of the Church of England, refused, and was in consequence deprived of his living. The judgment of the supreme court of Capetown in favour of the Bishop was reversed by the Privy Council, June 25, 1863.

Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the council of which had requested their advice, should withhold confidence from the Bishop of Natal until he is cleared from the charges brought against him: That the said Bishop should be prohibited from officiating in English dioceses, and called on to resign his office, whereupon forty-one Bishops signed an address requesting him to resign accordingly. In May, 1863, the two Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury condemned the views of Bishop Colenso, as expressed in his work on the Pentateuch, but took no further action in the matter.

In the autumn of the same year the scene of our narrative changes from England to South Africa. In November, 1863, the Bishop of Capetown, assisted by the Bishop of Grahamstown and the Bishop of the Orange Free State, tried the Bishop of Natal, who was cited before them by the Dean of Capetown and the Archdeacons of Grahamstown and George to answer certain charges of "false and erroneous doctrines and teaching contained in his works on the Epistle to the Romans, and on the Pentateuch," and he was sentenced to be deposed and afterwards excommunicated* for contumacy. The "trial" was twofold: public before the Bishop of Capetown as Metropolitan, and the two above-named Bishops as his assessors, and private before the same persons in another capacity as members of a Synod convened by the Bishop of Capetown.

On the 18th of June, 1864, by Order in Council, the petition of Bishop Colenso, appealing against the above mentioned sentence of deposition, was referred to the judicial committee of the Privy Council.

On the 28th of March, 1865, the judicial committee through the then Lord Chancellor (Lord Westbury) pronounced judgment, affirming, among others, the following propositions:—1. Letters Patent, unconfirmed by Acts of Imperial or Colonial Legislatures, have no force or effect in colonies possessing representative government, so as to give coercive legal jurisdiction. 2. The judgment pronounced against the Bishop of Natal by the Bishop of Capetown was null and void in law.

---

* The validity of this trial, and its canonicity, are disputed in a pamphlet entitled 'Remarks on the Proceedings at Capetown in the Matter of the Bishop of Natal,' by I. Brunel: Rivingtons, 1868.

In June, 1866, the matter was again discussed in both Houses of Convocation, but, as before, without any practical result.*

Passing from these resultless discussions in the Jerusalem Chamber to an almost equally resultless performance in the Cathedral Church of Natal, we arrive at the extraordinary scene of October 25, 1866. On that day, at a meeting held at Pieter Maritzburg (present about fifty laymen, twenty-five of whom voted, and sixteen clergymen out of a total of seventeen in the diocese), a resolution to elect a new Bishop was passed by the casting vote of the Dean; after which the meeting was adjourned to the cathedral, and the clergy present (seven in number) nominated in succession William Butler, priest, vicar of Wantage, in the diocese of Oxford, to be Bishop of Natal. The Dean then pronounced the said William Butler duly elected, and called on all to show cause why he should not be consecrated. Doubts being entertained as to the canonicity of this proceeding, Mr. Butler consulted the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Oxford, who first discouraged his acceptance of the post, but afterwards advised him to undertake it. Eventually he declined it.

Five days after the election of Mr. Butler another event occurred which is not without its significance, as indicating the feeling of those on the spot with reference to the Royal Supremacy.

On the 30th of October, 1866, at a Vestry meeting, held in the Cathedral of Pieter Maritzburg, present about two hundred and fifty members of the Church of England, the Rev. A. Tonnesen in the chair, after reciting the opinion of the meeting that the proceedings of October 25th amounted to a renunciation of the Queen's Supremacy, and therefore to a secession from the Church of England, and recording a protest against the same, the following declaration was unanimously passed:—

"That we remain, as we have been, an integral portion of the United Church of England and Ireland, recognising Her Majesty's

* The chief point debated appears to have been the propriety or otherwise of consecrating a new Bishop of Natal, and in the Upper House it was resolved, "That the existence of the Letters Patent would not cause the acceptance of a new Bishop to involve any loss of communion with the Mother Church provided that such Bishop be canonically consecrated, and that there be no invasion of the *title* of the Bishop of Natal conveyed by the Queen's Letters Patent."

supremacy, and submitting to the interpretation put on the standards and formularies of the Church by the Ecclesiastical or other Courts of the realm."

A petition to the Queen, praying that due discipline might be maintained in the diocese of Natal was also voted; and shortly afterwards a protest addressed to the Bishop of Capetown against the appointment of a new Bishop of Maritzburg was signed by 485 members of the Church of England.

The last event of the year 1866, and the most important in its bearings on this controversy, took place in this country. On the 6th of November, 1866, the Master of the Rolls delivered judgment on a bill filed by Bishop Colenso against the Trustees of the Colonial Bishopric Fund, viz., Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Hubbard, Vice-Chancellor Wood, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and others, calling on the defendants to set aside a sum of 10,000*l.* out of the Fund for the purpose of securing the income of the Bishop of Natal, and calling on them to pay him the arrears of his stipend, viz., 362*l.* per annum, withheld since 1864. The judgment, which was for the plaintiff, affirmed among others, the following propositions:—

1. Letters Patent, issued under the Great Seal, confer on bishops thereby appointed, in all colonies (whether possessing representative legislatures or not) the powers of "Orders," *i. e.* consecration, confirmation, ordination, &c., and of instituting to benefices, granting licenses to officiate, also of appointing archdeacons, rural deans, commissaries, &c.

2. The powers conferred by such Letters Patent can be enforced, if resisted, only by recourse to the civil tribunals of colonies possessing free legislatures, with an ultimate appeal to the Queen in Council.

3. A colonial Church, claiming for itself independence of the Royal supremacy as exercised through the Queen in Council, and substituting for it the "*forum domesticum*" of the Archbishop of Canterbury, though professing to be "in union and full communion" with the Church of England, does not legally form part of that Church.

4. In colonies possessing free legislatures the only mode of legally enforcing ecclesiastical authority is through the civil

tribunals. Synods, whether diocesan or provincial, are simply "*vbra domestica.*"

The judgment of the Master of the Rolls entered into many details not here alluded to; but it is sufficient for our present purpose to enumerate as above the main principles laid down as affecting the actual condition of the colonial Church in the eye of the law.

We have brought down our narrative to the close of 1866. The following year presents (with the exception of the report of the "Lambeth Conference") no event worthy of record in connexion with the South African controversy; but in the autumn of 1867 steps were taken by the Bishop of Natal which have, in their results, materially affected his legal *status* in his own diocese. In September, 1867, Bishop Colenso instituted proceedings in the Supreme Court of Natal against the Dean of Pieter Maritzburg, the Rev. James Walton, and the Rev. J. S. Robinson as having declined to acknowledge his jurisdiction: the case being brought before the Court in the form of petitions by the Bishop of Natal for Orders of the Court confirming his sentences passed on the 9th of May previously on the three above-named clergymen, and for an Order interdicting and restraining them from officiating or preaching within any of the churches or buildings set apart for the use of the Church of England in Natal, of which the Bishop is trustee. On the 9th of September the Court, in giving judgment on the Dean's case, decided (Phillips, Justice, *dissentiente*) that "the Letters Patent to the Bishop of Natal having been granted before the colony had any form of representative legislature, and while it was 'a Crown colony properly so called,' are perfectly valid to constitute a legal see, and to give power to the Bishop, as they profess to do, to visit all rectors, curates, ministers, and chaplains, and all priests and deacons in Holy Orders of the United Church of England and Ireland resident within the diocese of Natal." And Chief Justice Harding held that the absence of specific words expressly saving the concurrent rights of legislation to the Crown, which are not to be found either in the Letters Patent creating the Cape Council in 1825, or in those creating the Natal Council in 1847, made no difference whatever in the actual constitutional position of Natal, seeing that the Crown did repeatedly, from the first

existence of the colony until the establishment of representative government in 1856, legislate for Natal by Letters Patent, Charters, Orders in Council, and Royal Instructions. The judgment of Chief Justice Harding is valuable, as containing a very precise definition of a Crown colony in the following words:—

"If I were called upon to define the meaning of the terms, 'a Crown colony properly so called,' I should say it was this: namely, a colony or settlement acquired by the British Crown by conquest or treaty; in which the power of legislation rested with the sovereign by virtue of the Queen's prerogative, or in which legislation rested with the official nominees of the Crown, appointed by the Crown in that behalf; in which the revenue and expenditure were in the absolute control and disposal of the Crown; in which the lands of the colony were vested in and were disposed of only by the Crown; in which the accounts of the revenue and expenditure were examined by and allowed or disallowed by Her Majesty's Commissioners of Audit in London; and in which the inhabitants of the colony had no voice or power whatever, either as to legislation or anything else connected with Government. I think a colony or settlement in the position just described would be essentially a Crown colony properly so called; at any rate it would not be possessed of an independent legislature. If this definition is correct, then it represents exactly the condition in which the colony of Natal was in the year 1853, and previously, and subsequently; while, as I have already shown, the Cape colony was possessed of an independent legislature, consisting of an Elective Assembly and Legislative Council."

Of this judgment it is necessary here only to say that, however it may appear at first sight to conflict in some respects with that of the Privy Council in 1865, it distinctly tends to confirm, in harmony with all previous decisions of the Courts at home, the *status* of Dr. Colenso as Bishop of Natal.

But while these events were apparently establishing the Bishop more firmly in his own diocese, the efforts, to which we have already alluded, to start a competitor for the see were being carried on vigorously in England. In January, 1868, in consequence of a public intimation on the part of the Bishop of Capetown of an intention to consecrate a new Bishop for Natal, the Bishop of London and the Archbishops of Canterbury and York cautioned the Bishop of Capetown against carrying out this intention within the limits of their respective jurisdictions.

About the same time a proposal having been made to consecrate the intended bishop (Mr. Macrorie) in Scotland, and the Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church having intimated his willingness to sanction the proceeding, it was, at the advice of the Archbishop of Canterbury, abandoned, as were also other attempts to obtain consecration in Lancashire, at Oxford, and at Canterbury.

In February, 1868, the two Houses of Convocation again took action in the matter, which, however, except as an expression of opinion, was without practical result.* In July of the same year, the Upper House, to which memorials on the subject had been presented, adopted the Report of a Committee to which the validity of the Bishop of Capetown's proceedings had been referred. That Report, on grounds therein set forth, affirmed in the opinion of the Upper House: 1st. That substantial justice was done to the accused; 2nd. That "though the sentence, having been pronounced by a tribunal not acknowledged by the Queen's Courts, whether Ecclesiastical or Civil, can claim no legal effect, the Church as a *spiritual* body may rightly accept its validity."

Such are the leading events, briefly summarized, of a controversy, the final issue of which may be remote, and the future phases of which it is impossible to conjecture. Nor is it easy to review with advantage what must be regarded as little more than a fragment of a transaction manifestly incomplete. But an impartial survey of the case in all its bearings, so far as it has proceeded, will probably induce even those whose theological convictions yield the most reluctant obedience to judicial decisions, to abandon any ill-considered attempts to evict from his diocese a bishop, whose position must be assailed, if at all, by other agencies of attack than a mere defiance of the law. By that law, as it now stands, Dr. Colenso

* Feb. 19, 1868.—The Lower House of Convocation, on the motion of Canon Seymour, voted an *articulus cleri* praying the Upper House to take measures to declare that the Church of England accepts as valid the excommunication and deposition of Dr. Colenso. This motion was carried by 45 to 26 votes.

Feb. 21, 1868.—The Upper House of Convocation resolved, "That a Committee of this House be appointed to inquire into the canonicity of Dr. Colenso's deprivation, and to examine and report on his more recent writings . . . and that, in view of the canonical difficulties of the case, aggravated as we feel them to be by the announcement of the new judgment in the Supreme Court of Natal, we think it right to postpone our decision on the matters laid before us."

is indisputably for good or evil Bishop of Natal. Attempts have, indeed, been made by hinting inconsistencies in the various judgments of the Courts, and by wrenching from their context the *obiter dicta* with which they are interspersed, and forcibly incorporating them into the texts of judicial decisions, to represent confusion and uncertainty as the net result, and to found thereon a demand for legislative remedies. But when all the judgments are fairly considered, that of the Judicial Committee in 1865, that of the Master of the Rolls in 1866, and of the Supreme Court of Natal in 1868, will be found to harmonize substantially as declarations of the actual bearings of the law on the facts then in issue, though as to other and irrelevant points the Judges who formed those tribunals respectively may have differed. Whether the Judicial Committee or the Master of the Rolls may or may not have supposed Natal to have been a Crown colony when the Patent was issued, is quite as unimportant, so far as the main points decided by them are concerned, as whether they believed or disbelieved in the canonicity of the proceedings taken in the matter of Bishop Colenso by the Bishop of Capetown. By the concurrent decisions of three Courts, pronounced on three distinct occasions, the legal *status* of Dr. Colenso as Bishop of Natal is placed beyond dispute.*

Whatever claims a rival Bishop, consecrated under any other designation for the same see might, on the ground of compact with his clergy, attempt to assert in the civil courts of the colony, would rest on the same basis, and no other, than those which any competitor with any one of the forty colonial bishops of the Anglican Church might at any time seek to establish.

The Bishop of Capetown and his partisans, who are now, for good or for evil, in the position of defeated litigants, may of

* One argument indeed pointing to an opposite conclusion is so ingenious in its texture as to be worthy of notice. It was first contended by the Bishop of Capetown in his controversy with Mr. Long, afterwards by Sir Roundell Palmer and Mr. Selwyn in their speeches before the Privy Council, and again by Mr. Justice Connor in the Supreme Court of Natal, that, inasmuch as the Letters Patent by which the original diocese of Capetown was erected in 1847 have never been cancelled, notwithstanding the resignation of the Bishop created by them, the Letters Patent still exist, and have created a corporation with a local sphere of action which has become one of the institutions of the Cape Colony, and indestructible except by a legislative act of that Colony. The inference founded on this state of things is that the Crown was barred in 1853 from creating the three new Sees of Capetown, Grahamstown, and Natal, and that consequently the titles of all these Bishops are invalid.

course by counter-movements, legislative or judicial, agitate for a practical reversal of the relative positions now occupied by themselves and their adversaries. A grave question in consequence presents itself to the Church at home as to the attitude to be taken at this crisis by those who recognise in the Natal controversy an evidence of the gradually widening rift which is severing the State from the Church through all the provinces of the British empire.

To those, of course, who regard the supremacy of the Crown in matters ecclesiastical as an intolerable burden, even where, as in the United Kingdom, it brings with it the compensation of legally secured endowments, the caricature of Church and State presented by the flimsy credentials of Letters Patent, and the empty form of royal nomination, must be eminently distasteful. And it is not surprising that the advocates of a Free Church should find even a more favourable platform in the colonies than at home. They say—and with truth—that the bargain is one-sided. Their bishops and clergy do not even get the food and shelter which is the consideration received by their brethren at home for wearing what Mr. Hallam calls "the collar of the watch-dog." Their power and freedom of action are, if not actually, theoretically fettered by masters who have no equivalent either in dignity, authority, or worldly advantages to confer. The Patent, even supposing it to be valid, gives nothing to its possessor which his own character and the consent of his flock will not as fully confer on him. All the clerical arguments against the Royal Supremacy find sympathy in free colonies, not only among the enemies of dominant Churches who swarm everywhere, but among the aspirants to colonial independence who want to elect all their officers, and regard all nominations by the Crown as badges of tyranny and oppression.

The Apostle of Colonial Emancipation abroad joins hands with the Advocate of Ecclesiastical Liberty at home, and both strive together to shake off every remaining symbol of Royal Domination. "The High Churchman," according to Bishop Colenso, "longing for development and feeling that in England the battle may be fought with only tardy and partial success, looks to the colonies as the field where a system may be established which shall ultimately re-act on England." And, it

may be added, in his aspirations for what, in his opinion, the Law *ought to be*, he sometimes forgets what it actually *is*. Yearning for "those true constitutional and Catholic principles which will stand high above the mere rubbish of legal decisions,"* he appeals indignantly from all earthly tribunals to the ultimate jurisdiction of his own conscience. "If," says the Bishop of Capetown, "human law does affect to constrain the Church to hold communion with unbelievers, I ask, with all seriousness, is the law to be obeyed?"† In this spirit it is that Episcopal Letters Patent are surrendered, synodical tribunals constituted and armed with the fullest powers in matters of doctrine and discipline, and all the machinery improvised which the ecclesiastical exigencies of Independent Churches may conceivably require. Whether the final blow which is to strike off the fetters of the Colonial Church is to be an Act of the Imperial Parliament, or a formal surrender by the Crown of Ecclesiastical Supremacy, or to be the result of some possible future decision of some final Court of Appeal hereafter to be created, or whether the object is to be gradually accomplished through the various Colonial Legislatures, the advocates of emancipation do not inform us. It would nevertheless appear that, by some process yet undeveloped, the State control which is the source of all their troubles is to be withdrawn from all the daughter-churches in the Anglican Communion. Here, in England, we submit more patiently to the Royal supremacy knowing as we do that Papal supremacy or anarchy are our only alternatives. But in the colonies it is otherwise, and political severance from the Crown may be said to be, with those who have devoted thought and attention to the subject, a rather popular prescription for the maladies of the Colonial Church.

Mr. Montague Bernard, who appears to have considered this question, is "strongly persuaded that whatever we may think or desire, whatever troubles or difficulties the Colonial Church may have to encounter in time to come, whatever theories may be spun or expedients imagined, neither judgments of courts,

---

* Speech of Dr. Jebb in Lower House of Convocation, Feb. 13, 1867.—*Chron. of Convoc.*, p. 726.

† 'Statement,' p. 48.

nor Acts of local Legislatures, nor Statutes of the Imperial Parliament, can establish or perpetuate in the colonies an ecclesiastical supremacy of the Crown over a single denomination. The principle that the Church in the colonies is a voluntary society must," he says, "be recognized frankly and thoroughly by the law and by Churchmen themselves, and whatever we do must be based on it, if we wish that what we do shall last." * Mr. Mozley, oppressed by what he calls the "legal principle of construction," and its application to the doctrinal disputes of the Colonial Church, sees "but one solution of the question before us, namely the ultimate organization of the whole Colonial Church upon a voluntary basis." †

Mr. Fremantle on the other hand expresses a very strong opinion that the time for this separation of Church and State in the colonies is not yet come, and without holding any theory of the necessary dependence of the Church upon the State, reminds us that "the colonies are communities varying in all degrees in their administration, from the uncontrolled exercise of the power of the Crown, to an almost nominal dependence on the mother-country."

"The capability of a community to organize its own affairs is," he truly says, "a good index of the capability of its members to handle the delicate questions of Church Government." ‡

The published opinions of the Bishop of St. David's,§ of the Dean of Westminster,‖ of the Dean of Ripon,¶ of Mr. Fitzjames Stephen,** Archdeacon Hale, and Mr. Ralph Barnes, who have strongly and ably deprecated any movement tending to hasten the severance of the colonial churches from the Crown, are well known to all who have followed the literature of the South African controversy.

---

* 'Remarks on some late decisions respecting the Colonial Church,' by Montague Bernard, M.A., p. 21.

† 'Observations on the Colonial Church Question,' by the Rev. J. B. Mozley, B.D., p. 47.

‡ 'Church Government in the Colonies,' by the Rev. W. H. Fremantle.—*Contemporary Review*, Feb. 1866, p. 342.

§ 'Charge delivered by C. Thirlwall, D.D., Bishop of St. David's, in October 1866.'

‖ 'Speech on the South African Controversy by A. P. Stanley, D.D., Dean of Westminster, in the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury, June 29, 1866.'

¶ 'Speech on the Natal Bishopric Question, by W. Goode, D.D., Dean of Ripon, in the Convocation of the Province of York, Feb. 7, 1868.'

** 'What is the Law of the Church of England?' by Fitzjames Stephen, Q.C.—*Fraser's Magazine*, Feb. 1865.

In the presence of so striking a conflict of opinions we are naturally invited to some investigation into the actually existing relations between the Colonial Church and the parent State. The Colonial Episcopate, exclusive of missionary bishops beyond the pale of the empire, comprises forty dioceses, and has been the gradual growth of little more than eighty years. Of these dioceses the greater number have been created by Letters Patent; confirmed in some cases by Imperial Acts, in others recognized by Provincial Legislatures, but varying in form and extent of powers conferred thereby.*

If we examine for a moment the striking diversities in the actual present position of these forty colonial dioceses, we shall see at once the utter impossibility of applying with any hope of success an uniform treatment to communities differing so widely in their circumstances. Of the whole number, five, comprising the Canadian dioceses of Montreal, Quebec, Toronto, Huron, and Ontario, may be said to have actually achieved their independence of the Royal Supremacy, and to be now, in all political respects, independent churches. In 1857, the Diocesan and Provincial Synods (which in pursuance of resolutions adopted at various previous Episcopal Conferences had been called into existence) were, by an Act of the Canadian Legislature, empowered to "frame constitutions and make regulations for enforcing discipline in the Church, and for the appointment, deposition, deprivation, or removal of any person bearing office therein, of whatever order or degree, any rights of the Crown to the contrary notwithstanding." Under the powers given by this Act, which received the Royal Assent, the Canadian Synods have since elected their own bishops. But it was not until 1866 that the last link, supposed still to exist between the Sovereign of England and the Church of Canada, was broken, when on the occasion of an election of a coadjutor bishop of Toronto, the then Secretary of State announced, in a despatch dated Nov. 21, 1866, in reply to a communication from the colony, that the Royal Mandate which, according to the Preamble of Stat. 26 Geo. III., cap. 84, and other Acts, had been held to be an essential pre-requisite to the consecration of

* See Parliamentary Paper, 276, 1866, on 'Colonial Bishoprics.'

all Anglican bishops, was unnecessary in the case of those consecrated in Canada.

Up to the present time the five Canadian dioceses above enumerated stand on grounds entirely distinct from the rest of the Colonial Church. For though the six dioceses * of New Zealand have, by the Ecclesiastical Constitution created by the Auckland Conference in 1857, committed to their Diocesan and Provincial Synods the nomination of bishops, together with all powers of creating tribunals for the maintenance of doctrine and discipline, these arrangements (except so far as they may have been confirmed by the Trusts' Act of 1858), have no legislative sanction. In the remaining dioceses, namely, in the eight Australasian of which the Bishop of Sydney is metropolitan (viz., Brisbane, Newcastle, Goulburn, Grafton, Melbourne, Adelaide, Tasmania, and Sydney itself), and the four South African, namely, Capetown, Grahamstown, Natal, and St. Helena, the powers claimed in those in which any synodical action exists, in no way affect the Royal Supremacy. The same may be said of the dioceses of Nova Scotia, Guiana, Colombo, and Labuan, in which the Synods claim no powers requiring legislative sanction. In the two dioceses of Fredericton and Rupertsland conferences have been held with a view to synodical action, but no actual steps have been taken.

In the remaining fourteen dioceses of Newfoundland, Columbia, Jamaica, Nassau, Antigua, Barbadoes, Sierra Leone, Mauritius, Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, Victoria, Perth, and Gibraltar, no synodical action exists, nor, so far as recent reports inform us, have any attempts been made to establish it.

But the diversity of our colonial dioceses, in respect of their actual ecclesiastical condition, so far as their own internal government is concerned, is not more striking than that exhibited in the relations existing between the various dioceses and the secular power as embodied in Colonial and Imperial Legislation.

We have, for example, the three East Indian and the six West Indian bishoprics, established by Acts of the Imperial Legislature, and hitherto endowed in the latter case by grants from the

* The term "diocese," as here used, must be understood to include any district placed under the separate control of a Bishop.

Consolidated Fund.* In thirty-two dioceses, again, episcopal endowments are provided partly by funds raised by religious societies in England, and partly by grants from colonial legislatures; and in three instances, viz., those of Adelaide, Cape Town, and British Columbia, by the munificence of an individual founder. It is not as affording any argument for or against the maintenance of the Royal Supremacy over the Colonial Church that these diversities in the sources of episcopal endowments are adverted to. Imperial grants, which may of course be cancelled at any time by the authority of Parliament, carry with them no permanent accessories of power or patronage. Neither, on the other hand, is there the slightest foundation for the plea urged by the New Zealand prelates in 1865, that "appointments to bishoprics founded by private efforts, and endowed from private resources, form no part of the royal prerogative." †

The diverse sources of its endowments add only one to the many illustrations of the difficulties attending the wholesale reorganisation of so tesselated a fabric as the Colonial Church.

Whether we look to their origin, history, or traditions, or to the races which have been from time to time incorporated into communities so various, each colonial diocese or group of dioceses demands a distinct and separate consideration before we can even classify them for any practical purposes.

It is not merely that the powers of the Crown and of the Parliament depend on the mode in which the colonies have been acquired, and on the conditions on which they have been held, nor is it only that the concession of free legislatures has in so many cases stripped the Crown of its prerogative, while in others the ancient relations between the Sovereign and the Colonial Church remain unimpaired. We have to consider the social as well as the political condition of these various communities, consisting in some cases of mixed races and creeds, in others of civilised populations, presenting in some instances a fair supply

* These grants were formerly charged on the Four-and-a-Half Per Cent. Export Duties levied in the islands, and afterwards on the Imperial Treasury. A Bill proposing their withdrawal was read a second time in the House of Lords, July 7, 1868.

† *Vide* 'Petition of Bishops of the Church of England in New Zealand, asking permission to surrender their Letters Patent, and to fill by election in General Synod vacancies arising in their own order.'—*Correspondence on Colonial Bishops*, presented May 17, 1866.

of the requisite material for ecclesiastical self-government; in others utterly wanting in the *personnel* which the successful working of Synods, or Church Assemblies, or an Elective Episcopacy imply. The Colonial Church is, in fact, no more one homogeneous whole than the Colonial Empire, and perhaps the most serious errors that have hitherto characterised our treatment of both, have arisen from an ignorant or indolent indifference to these diversities. As the colonies which now form the British empire are in fact nothing more than a heap of territorial atoms thrown under a single rule in the course of three centuries by the rough chances of war, the subtle agencies of diplomacy, and the bold spirit of Anglo-Saxon adventure, so what we call the Colonial Church consists in truth of some forty or fifty outposts of Christian civilisation, planted with episcopal organisation, for the most part voluntarily, by self-organised societies, sometimes with the aid of public funds, and in some cases still under the political control of the parent State —in some partially—in others almost entirely, swept off, together with the communities in which they have been founded, from the sphere of Imperial gravitation.

We still designate not only our vast and growing provinces in Australia and North America, which have almost assumed the rank of independent principalities, but the isolated military garrisons and naval dépôts dotted over the world for the protection of the courses of our trade, by the generic title of "colonies;" but the statesman who attempted to prescribe for British citizens at Melbourne or Montreal a constitution which should precisely match that which satisfied and suited the handful of Englishmen at Hong Kong or Heligoland, would manifest no more incompetency for his task than the ecclesiastical constitution-maker who assumed as a matter of course that the same system of Church government which was good for Capetown and Sydney was good also for Gibraltar and Sierra Leone.

Every statesman professing the slightest acquaintance with the political condition of the colonies knows of course very well that whatever the Imperial Government may desire to do in dealing with the Colonial Church, its powers are limited to a very narrow range. Nor are they easy of exercise even for the very few purposes to which they can be applied at all, as the

abortive legislative attempts of the Sessions of 1866 and 1867 sufficiently prove.*

For the purposes of their present and future treatment at the hands of the Imperial government, the dioceses of the Colonial Church fall naturally into precisely the same two classes as indicated by the Committee of the Privy Council when adjudicating on the validity of Episcopal Patents in 1865, namely:

1. Those which possess representative institutions.

2. Those which, under the designation of "Crown Colonies," or any other title, are still practically, for ecclesiastical as well as civil purposes, under Imperial control.

With reference to the first of these two classes, our course is tolerably clear. Every colony or group of colonies which has a Parliament of its own can of course at any time follow the example set by Canada, and assuming the Royal Assent to be given to such legislation, free the Episcopalians within its borders from every remaining symbol of Imperial authority. It is simply a question of time, and of the policy which may guide the colonial legislatures. The Episcopal body may indeed in some cases, as in that of New Zealand in 1865, vest by mutual compact in self-constituted Synods such powers of arbitration on ecclesiastical disputes as may practically withdraw them from the adjudication of the civil courts; but it is not until legislative enactments passed by the colonial Assemblies, and sanctioned by the Crown, have divested the Church in any given colony of every remnant of its Imperial attributes, that its emancipation will (as is already the case in Canada) have been completely accomplished.

With respect to the second class of dioceses above mentioned, comprising altogether fourteen, situated in dependencies not possessing representative institutions, our task may possibly prove more complicated.

Besides the Crown Colonies properly so called, we have the three East Indian dioceses of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, in

* The Bill of 1866 was entitled, 'A Bill to remove doubts as to the effect of Letters Patent granted to certain Colonial Bishops, and to amend the Law with respect to Bishops and Clergy in the Colonies.' The Bill of 1867 was entitled, 'A Bill to remove doubts as to the effect of Letters Patent granted to certain Colonial Bishops, and to provide for the disposal of property upon the death of such Bishops.'

which the extensive powers given under the sanction of Parliament, by Letters Patent, have proved practically insufficient to invest the bishops with coercive jurisdiction.* Whether the defect can be properly supplied through the action of diocesan Synods remains to be proved.

In the mean time a case has recently occurred in Ceylon, illustrating the form in which Synods may, even in Crown Colonies, affect to nullify the prerogative of the Crown in the nomination of bishops. In 1865, at the first Synod of the diocese of Colombo, a resolution was passed to the effect that every appointment to any ecclesiastical office in the diocese be in future contingent on the signature of a declaration of theological opinions prescribed by the Synod. This proposal, which if acted on would have practically ousted the Crown of all patronage, has received no encouragement from the Home Government, but affords an illustration of the class of questions likely to arise from time to time, even in that portion of the Colonial Church which is presumed still to acknowledge the Queen in all matters ecclesiastical and civil as Supreme.

Difficult and perplexing as may be its application in all cases, the broad principle which should guide the Home Government in dealing with the Crown Colonies in Church matters is sufficiently simple. It is because they are incapable of or unripe for self-government in secular matters that they are "Crown Colonies" at all. In almost all of them the materials for representative Assemblies are wholly wanting, and it is not very likely that such communities could possess the materials for Church Synods. And if they cannot govern themselves, probably all, except those who dread Erastianism more than anarchy, will admit that *some* external control in some form or other is required. If a colony is not sufficiently advanced to elect its own Parliaments, is it to be presumed capable of electing its own Bishops? and, if not, in what hands but those of the Sovereign is their nomination to be vested?

But we are sometimes told that the Sovereign of to-day is not, as in the days of the Tudors and the Stuarts, the depository of a personal prerogative; that the power which the despots of other

---

* *Vide* a paper on the 'Legal Position of the Church in India,' by the Hon. Mr. Justice Gibbs. Bombay, 1867.

times wielded themselves is now exercised through ever-changing ministers, and on this circumstance a rather singular argument is founded for the renunciation altogether of Royal authority in ecclesiastical affairs. It seems to be entirely forgotten by this class of reasoners that their argument, if it has any force at all, applies quite as much to the civil as to the ecclesiastical prerogatives of the Crown. If the Queen has no longer any right to appoint Bishops in the colonies because she does so through her ministers, she has for the same reason no longer any right to appoint Governors or other civil functionaries beyond the seas, in the dependencies of the Crown—a position for which probably even the most advanced opponents of order and authority are not as yet prepared. But in real truth the fact that the Royal prerogative is in the present day constitutionally exercised, instead of weakening, greatly strengthens all the arguments for its maintenance, especially in ecclesiastical affairs. Kings who could "do no wrong," and Queens who in a momentary fit of caprice could "unfrock" their Bishops, were far less fit to be trusted with their selection than Constitutional Sovereigns, whose every act requires the sanction of Parliament and of public opinion, before it can be enforced. If monarchs who could create High-Commission Courts at pleasure could be tolerated in other days as the depositories of appellate jurisdiction, we may thankfully accept the mild arbitration exercised by constitutional tribunals, every individual member of which is invested with authority by an executive responsible to Parliament and to the country.

Whatever objections may be raised to the precise constitution of the Committee of the Privy Council, which has now fulfilled for thirty-five years the functions of the ancient Court of Delegates—a tribunal which had for three centuries represented the Crown in matters ecclesiastical—there are few who will contend that the substitution of a purely episcopal and self-constituted Court of Appeal would afford any additional guarantee for the avoidance of ecclesiastical litigation or the maintenance of the orthodox faith. And even those who are least satisfied with the Court as it stands admit that the cause of order, to say nothing of the cause of Christianity, would be imperilled by the abolition of all central tribunals in Church matters. The tendency of opinion on the subject points indeed to the enlargement of the area and strengthening of the powers of a Court of Appeal, to

which all British subjects, of whatever race or creed, in all provinces of our empire, may, in all causes civil, criminal, and spiritual, claim an ultimate resort. In all questions touching doctrine, it would of course be possible, if such a change were desired, to introduce into the composition of the Court an ecclesiastical element, as was done by the Church Discipline Act of 1840. But until such reforms and expansions as may be needed in the constitution of our Court of Appeal can be carried out, the result of an impartial consideration of the whole question in all its bearings, will unquestionably lead us to prefer what we have, rather than to catch at any of the alternatives which have yet been offered to us.

There is one topic to which, in conclusion, we cannot but advert, however briefly.

On the purely *doctrinal* topics raised by the South-African controversy we have carefully abstained from commenting, both because they have been fully discussed elsewhere, and also because they have no direct bearing on the points to which it is our present special object to call attention.

But there is an aspiration which seems to underlie so much of the religious energy which has characterized the disputants who both in South Africa and elsewhere have agitated for colonial emancipation in Church matters, that the unsound foundation on which it rests challenges exposure.

It is in the interest of the "unity of Christendom," of the maintenance of the "Catholic faith," that the Bishop of Capetown and his friends claim the abolition of every remaining token of Royal Supremacy over the Colonial Church. It is with the avowed object of rescuing the branches of the Anglican Communion in our distant dependencies from "soul-destroying errors" and "pestilent heresies" that a numerous and influential section of theologians threaten, in defiance of the laws of England, to establish for themselves an independence; founded, not on the ecclesiastical or civil constitution of Great Britain, but on some recondite muniments borrowed from other lands in bygone times. Have they well weighed the inevitable result of this movement, if successful, on the "Catholic truth" and "Church principles" which it is their professed object to maintain, extend, and perpetuate? We will assume that they succeed in getting rid of Bishop Colenso, and possibly even in electing

another Bishop in his place; but at what cost will these objects, if attained at all, be purchased? The lowest possible price will be an ecclesiastical civil war, illustrated by all the scandals and coarseness which have always the fullest play in newly formed communities—a war which will involve practical anarchy while it lasts, and which, however and whenever it may end, can scarcely fail to leave an enduring root of bitterness in the torn and distracted community of Natal.

And if we extend our view beyond the horizon of South Africa to those vast and widely scattered Christian communities which are still called branches of the United Church of England and Ireland, and suppose them to have achieved the freedom for which some enthusiasts are prepared to barter all their present privileges, what is the prospect before us? Where are the guarantees for unity or for truth which all the apparatus of synods—diocesan, provincial, and imperial—have substituted for the worn-out Royal Supremacy which has been so contemptuously abandoned?

In the place of the forty affiliated or daughter-Churches, whose thraldom consisted in accepting a Bishop nominated by the Crown, and consecrated by Royal authority at home, we have in the case supposed, an equal number of scattered congregations bound to us by no tie, free to change their articles, and services, and doctrine, as they please; a process against which the laity if aggrieved have no appeal, and in resisting which neither laity nor clergy can, by resort to a central tribunal, find the redress now pronounced so worthless. Well may Miss Burdett Coutts—a witness entitled to be heard on such a question—deplore the illusions by which a section of the Colonial Church has been led to discard real and substantial advantages in pursuit of the phantom of ecclesiastical independence.

In a letter, dated December 28, 1865, and addressed by Miss Burdett Coutts to Lord Russell, this lady, the exclusive founder of the three colonial sees of Adelaide, Cape Town, and British Columbia, writes as follows:—

"A letter has recently been made public, on the part of the Bishop of Cape Town, in which the bishop assumes to be irresponsible as regards the Crown, and seems prepared (if funds should be forthcoming) to appoint a new Bishop of Natal. The five bishops of New Zealand have also combined to surrender their Letters Patent,

and have constituted themselves, with the concurrence of a portion of the clergy and laity of their dioceses, a body which they are pleased to designate as the Church of New Zealand, although in what sense a body of clergy who have severed their connection from the Crown of this kingdom can claim to be the Territorial Church of a dependency of that Crown, I am at a loss to understand. It appears to be the present intention of the bishops of South Africa and New Zealand to maintain full communion with the Church of England, and, in the case of the bishops of New Zealand, at least, to adopt the Archbishop of Canterbury as patriarch. But, if I interpret rightly the position which the Archbishop of Canterbury holds, no spiritual or ecclesiastical superiority appertains to him in regard to those Bishops, except under the Letters Patent of the Crown; for the act of consecration in which he may have taken part under the Royal Mandate did not confer upon him any such superiority. If, therefore, the Letters Patent are ineffectual to give him appellate jurisdiction, and the supremacy of the Crown in matters ecclesiastical does not take effect in those colonial dependencies, there will be no safeguard against the respective Churches declaring themselves to be in communion with the Church of any foreign country, and recognising, by a vote of the ruling majority, the supremacy of a foreign Bishop or Archbishop. And as there are many to whom the principle of uniformity commends itself more strongly than the duty of protest against error, it may come to pass at no distant time that the wish and aim of such a majority will be to bring about a fusion of widely differing Churches, and to recognize a common supremacy in the Pope of Rome, or in the Patriarch of Constantinople. Indications are not wanting of the existence of this spirit in the present day, as there are those working amongst us who, whilst as yet repudiating what is denominated the 'practical quasi-authoritative system of the Church of Rome,' would not scruple to acknowledge the primacy of the Bishop of that Church, and to assert that there is 'not any supremacy in itself to which the Church of England should object.' On the other hand, the Church of Rome is neither an inactive nor unintelligent spectator of these indications; and whilst it contemplates the division of the realm of England into two ecclesiastical provinces under the supreme jurisdiction of the Pope, an Archbishop of that Church has declared in his inaugural address, lately delivered almost within hearing of Westminster Hall, that 'Protestantism has nearly run out its appointed course of heresy,' and that 'in a generation or two the Anglican religion will be a page of history.' I for one cannot blame the members of the Church of Rome for seeking to carry out a system which they believe to be right; neither can I wish that

the spirit of toleration, the result of the civil and religious liberty we enjoy, should abate, even whilst it thus permits, or possibly fosters, these very hopes and endeavours. *But amidst these varied signs of the times, and in the face of coming difficulties, I value more and more, as priceless, the constitutional recognition of the Crown of this kingdom as 'in all causes, both ecclesiastical and civil, within its dominions supreme.'*"

The thoughts thus earnestly expressed have found an echo in the hearts of many who watch anxiously the future of the Colonial Church.

All who know the disadvantageous social and political conditions under which alone the experiment of ecclesiastical self-government can, for the most part, be attempted even in the most advanced British dependencies, would probably be ready to compound for the risks of occasional Ultra-Rationalist or Ultra-Ritualist appointments from home, rather than incur the perils (of which Canada has as yet only enjoyed the foretaste) of the scandals of contested Episcopal elections, and the endless jar of the various orders of self-constituted synods striving for the mastery.

In the face of dangers of which they have had sufficient warning, it is for churchmen in the Free Colonies to decide for themselves whether they will continue and cherish a time-honoured alliance and identity with the parent Church, or whether, on the other hand, the moment shall be chosen when the horizon is black with storms, for suddenly casting themselves from their firm anchorage-ground, and drifting away from their moorings into a stormy and troubled sea.

The Church of England in the Colonies is, as we are everlastingly reminded, "a voluntary association in the same situation with any other religious body, in no better, but in no worse position;" but this "voluntary association" is endowed not only with free will as to its internal administration, but is capable of deciding for itself whether the links which still bind it to the Mother Church shall be abruptly severed, or carefully strengthened and maintained. Let us hope that the decision of our brother Churchmen in the colonies may be clearly taken for the latter course, and that we may hear less henceforward of the perils of Erastianism, and more of the blessings of union.

And, be it remembered, it is not by imperial legislation, which, as recent experience has warned us, may fail of effect, nor by a course, however harmonious, of judicial decisions, that this result can be attained. It is on the controlling influence of public opinion in the *colonies*, even more than on the same influence at home, where the practical alternatives open to us are less fully known, that the issue may be said to depend.

Those whose only principle of action is to swim strong with the stream, and to assume that every institution which has been repeatedly and loudly denounced is therefore doomed, will probably accept the breaking up of the Colonial Church into its constituent elements as an inevitable destiny, if not an already accomplished fact.

Those, on the other hand, who have been taught by history and experience the inestimable value of a central controlling authority in things spiritual, which shall be free from the infection, or even imputation of theological bitterness,—who recognise, moreover, in the peculiar social and political condition of the British dependencies, powerful practical arguments indicating the necessity of providing from without that central authority which in the case of newly formed communities cannot adequately be supplied to them from within—will naturally, in the absence of any alternative machinery, strive to adapt to the exigencies of the time, that which has been since the Reformation our best security at home for the maintenance of civil liberty and religious truth.

Those who are not yet "fatigued with the weight of dear and glorious recollections," will still desire that so long as the flag of England waves over her distant colonies, it may be the symbol not only of a common nationality, but of a common faith. Knowing and accepting the fact that the Church of England "forms no part of the constitution in any colonial settlement," they know also that so long as the Church in any given colony is and professes to be a branch of the Church of England and Ireland, and not merely a distinct Church "in union and communion" therewith, so long will one guarantee at least remain to us for the application of uniform principles in the interpretation of doctrines and formularies in all causes which may be brought before the Central Court of Appeal.

Though it has been in its political and legal rather than its

spiritual aspects that we have reviewed this unhappy controversy, let it not be supposed that there is any desire to evade the doctrinal issues it involves. All who value religious truth, and believe that it has nothing to fear from an investigation of the foundations on which it rests, must of course desire that the whole question should be finally decided *on its merits*. If the present Bishop of Natal has exceeded in his writings the liberty which belongs to Clergymen, let this be proved in the proper court; but in the interest of truth no less than of order, let this attempt be abandoned altogether rather than prosecuted by an ecclesiastical agitation, presenting only an interminable vista of irritating counter-movements. If, as is alleged, vital doctrines have been called in question by this Bishop, to the distress and perplexity of earnest Christians, is it likely that this distress will be relieved by the bare announcement, unsustained by a single argument, that the impugner of these doctrines was, in the opinion of a small section of his English brethren, canonically deposed and excommunicated five years ago? A thoughtful and masterly defence of the doctrines so assailed, might indeed, even without the sanction of episcopal authority, have tended to quiet the minds of perplexed Churchmen, but it is difficult to imagine how, or by what process, troubled souls can derive comfort or strength from the discovery that a Prelate of the Anglican Church has been ejected from her communion by a process pronounced null and void by the highest Court in the empire. Principles of far deeper moment than any which concern only the outward relations of the Church are here at stake. It is only by a practical reverence for the *Law as it stands* that these principles can be effectually upheld. Regarding this question in all its aspects—legal, social, political, spiritual—our best human hope for the future is in the calm and deliberately expressed determination of an enlightened public opinion, which shall support and strengthen the hands of authority in standing together the slender ties which still unite the scattered dioceses of the British empire under the Common Supremacy of our Queen.

ARTHUR MILLS.

ESSAY VIII.

THE SCHISMATICAL TENDENCY OF RITUALISM.

By GEORGE SALMON, D.D.

Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY VIII.

The substantial identity of a party compatible with serious changes in its doctrines.

The anti-Romanist teaching of the 'Tracts for the Times.'

The question whether opposition to Romanism be part of the essential principles of the Tracts.

The claims of the Visible Church asserted in the Tracts, denied by opposite schools.

Attacks on the Act of Uniformity.

Opposition to Rome held by Dr. Newman to be necessary to the position of Anglicans.

The separation between England and Rome unjustifiable if there be no grave doctrinal differences.

The penalties with which causeless schism is in danger of being visited.

Rome cannot accept anything short of absolute submission.

The Church of England not Catholic if not Protestant.

Reverence to the Episcopal office taught in the 'Tracts for the Times.'

What Roman Catholics think of the treatment of Bishops by the Ritualists.

Theoretical Presbyterianism taught by Mr. Bennett.

Schismatical mode of presenting the doctrine of Apostolical succession.

The denial of the Church's power to decree rites and ceremonies.

The right of the Church to depart for good reason from primitive usage acknowledged by the Church of Rome.

No need to find precedents for all the Church's rules.

The rights of the laity do not permit a clergyman's absolute exemption from control.

Church Establishments, why unpopular with Ritualists.

Ritualist toleration.

THE SCHISMATICAL TENDENCY OF RITUALISM.

It has been frequently remarked that the political parties of modern times are very unlike those known by the same names in former days; the Whigs of Queen Anne's time might now pass for high Tories, the Conservatives who carried the Reform Bill of 1867 would thirty years ago have passed for extreme Radicals. But an absolute change in the opinions of parties does not always imply a change in their relative position; both may have partaken in a common motion, their attitude toward each other remaining unaltered. The parties at the present day desiring to change and desiring to maintain existing institutions may be said fairly to correspond to those between which there was a like struggle thirty years ago, even though it be true that Reformers then demanded less than Conservatives now are willing to concede.

I mean in this essay to speak of a fundamental difference in principle between some who at the present day profess to hold "Church principles," and those who used the same watchword in 1833. And I desire to show at the outset that I perfectly understand that the substantial identity of a party is quite compatible with a very serious change in the doctrines advocated by it. Successors of Luther may have gone on to question doctrines which he did not deny, and yet may be justified in claiming him as their teacher, and may be able to declare with truth that they have only gone a little further in the direction in which he led them. And so I would confess that the claims of men to be the legitimate representatives of the school founded by the 'Tracts for the Times' are not disproved by their being unable to subscribe to the anti-Roman declarations with which those tracts abound.

In the 'Tracts for the Times' was included a series of original tracts against Romanism, besides reprints of writings of elder divines, such as Bishop Cosin's 'History of Popish

Transubstantiation,' and Archbishop Ussher on 'Prayers for the Dead.' And incidentally, in tracts not immediately directed against the Church of Rome, her principles are condemned and her claims denied. Thus in Tract 30, the defence of the Church of England against the charge of apostasy is rested on one of her Articles, which many now in her Communion would not select for especial commendation. "There is one simple test by which we may at once assure ourselves that the Church of England has not fallen away from the faith of her Lord and Master. As the eternal truth of God is contained in His revealed word the Bible, no Church, whatever may be the errors of its individual members, can be said to have fallen away, and consequently to have lost her claims to the obedience of Christ's true disciples while she still reverences that Bible; while she puts it into the hand of each of her followers and bids him read it, and seek there, and there only, the proofs of the doctrine which she inculcates; and while she declares, as the Church of England does in her Sixth Article, that 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, and that whatsoever is not read therein nor may be proved thereby is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.'" The same tract gives the following account of the Reformation, which had not yet been discovered to have been "an act of vengeance," or a "merited chastisement." "Though we in a common way call the Papists or followers of the Pope Catholics, yet it is we who are the true Catholics: for the term only means members of Christ's universal Church. The history of the Papists is this:—Many centuries ago strange and corrupt notions and practices prevailed in many of the Churches in Europe. Among others, people thought the Pope or Bishop of Rome was gifted with authority from heaven to control all the branches of the Church on earth, and that his word was to be of more weight than even the Holy Scriptures themselves. But about three hundred years ago the Bishops of the Church of England saw these errors in their true light; they saw that the Pope's authority was not founded on Scripture, and they consequently refused to acknowledge it, while they at the same time corrected upon Scripture principles the other errors and evil practices which I have

alluded to." What these errors are is stated in Tract 38, in which the writer enumerates some of his "irreconcilable differences" with Rome, following the order observed by Bishop Hall in his treatise on 'The Old Religion.' "I consider that it is unscriptural to say with the Church of Rome that we are justified by inherent righteousness; that it is unscriptural that the good works of a man justified do *truly* merit eternal life; that the doctrine of Transubstantiation, as not being revealed, but a thing of man's devising, is profane and impious; that the denial of the cup to the laity is a bold and unwarranted encroachment on their privileges as Christ's people; that the sacrifice of masses, as it has been practised in the Roman Church, is without foundation in Scripture or antiquity, and therefore blasphemous and dangerous; that the honour paid to images is very full of peril in the case of the uneducated, that is, of the great part of Christians; that indulgences, as in use, are a gross and monstrous invention of later times; that the received doctrine of purgatory is at variance with Scripture, cruel to the better sort of Christians, and administering deceitful comfort to the irreligious; that the practice of celebrating divine service in an unknown tongue is a great corruption; that forced confession is an unauthorized and dangerous practice; that the direct invocation of saints is a dangerous practice, as tending to give, often actually giving, to creatures the honour and reliance due to the Creator alone; that there are not seven sacraments; that the Romish doctrine of Tradition is unscriptural; that the claim of the Pope to be universal bishop is against Scripture and antiquity. I might add other points in which also I protest against the Church of Rome, but I think it enough to make my confession in Hall's order, and so leave it."

To this detailed enumeration of Romish errors it is scarcely necessary to add condemnations of Romanism expressed in general terms. For instance, in Tract 20 we are told in capital letters that "AN UNION [with the Papists] IS IMPOSSIBLE. Their communion is infected with heterodoxy; we are bound to flee it as a pestilence. They have established a lie in the place of God's truth, and by their claim of immutability in doctrine cannot undo the sin they have committed. They cannot repent. Popery must be destroyed; it cannot be reformed."

Notwithstanding these and many other passages to the same

effect that might be produced, a plausible case may be made out for maintaining that those who adopt these statements to the letter are not so truly the disciples of the 'Tracts for the Times' as those who have quite abandoned all protest against Roman teaching. It may be said that these passages in which Scripture is made the measure of truth, and in which all that can find no Scripture warrant is rejected, only exhibit lingering traces of the Protestantism in which Dr. Newman and his fellow-labourers had been educated, and which it took them a long time to outgrow. It may be urged that these occasional assaults on Romanism were felt at the time to be inconsistent with the general teaching of the Tracts, and that consequently they had no perceptible effect in abating the outcry that from the first was raised against the Tracts as Romanising. And that the enemies of the Tracts judged more correctly than their friends of their real tendency is inferred from the history of Dr. Newman himself, who, even before he had left the Church of England, formally retracted what he had said against the Church of Rome in the passages to which I have referred, and in others like them. On the whole, it is contended that the writers of the 'Tracts for the Times,' and the extreme Ritualistic party of the present day, have their faces set in the same direction; that the latter has done no more than advance further on the road which was marked out for them by the former. If principles strongly asserted in the Tracts are now denied, it is said that these are not in real truth the principles of the Tracts, but only traditional errors into the expression of which the writers were led by prudence and a desire to conciliate prejudices which at the time they had not shaken off themselves.

But there is one point in which the party of which I speak differs from the 'Tracts for the Times,' not by going on further in the same direction and carrying out the principles of the Tracts to legitimate consequences not perceived by the writers, but by turning round the opposite way and completely abandoning the principles on which the Tract writers laid most stress.

At the time when the Tracts appeared there was a number of good men who paid exclusive attention to the relations between the individual Christian and his Saviour, and totally disregarded the obligations Christians were under as members of a society. The true Christian Church was, according to their view, the

aggregate of persons who theoretically held, and were practically influenced by, certain doctrines regarded as fundamental, and which were considered as pre-eminently entitled to be called "the Gospel." The important point was, what doctrines a man held, not to what denomination he belonged. Clergymen of the same Communion were practically excommunicated if thought to be unsound in Gospel doctrine, and were not allowed to preach in Evangelical pulpits; on the other hand, the right hand of fellowship was freely given to ministers of other denominations if they held the doctrines which were considered as important. It was thought a light matter to disregard obedience to rubrics and other Church ordinances for which no direct Scripture authority could be produced, and which therefore were counted as man's commands, not God's. In opposition to these views the Tract writers set themselves to maintain the claims and authority of the Church regarded as a visible society, divinely appointed and entitled to claim the obedience of its members; and they dwelt strongly on the sin of schism and wilful disobedience.

Now these are the "Church principles," which, as it seems to me, the extreme Ritualists have altogether abandoned; they seem to have no perception that schism is a sin; their own principles appear to be essentially schismatical, and their whole proceedings to be characterised by wilfulness, private judgment, and contempt of lawful authority. With them, too, the great question is, what doctrines a man holds, not to what denomination he belongs. Clergymen of their own communion, supposed to be unsound on the doctrines which they think important, are practically excommunicated as Protestant heretics: others, who take their stand on the positions originally defended in the 'Tracts for the Times,' receive a contemptuous toleration as "mere Anglicans." Romish clergy in England are fraternised with because sound in doctrine, notwithstanding their schismatical position. "At first," says a writer in 'The Church and the World' (first series, p. 240), "I was startled when I found friendly intercourse and fellowship existing between Anglo-Catholic and Anglo-Roman priests, and I had some lingering Anglican notions on the subject of 'Our Church,' which were first shaken by a paper bearing that title in the 'Union Review.' Our Church is after all the English body of bishops and priests providing those who live in England with the grace of the

sacraments, but to call ourselves members of any local Church, and feel bound to adhere to the creed of any local Church, in distinction to that of the Universal Church, is a mere modernism." Thus the "Universal Church," in this system, takes the place that was occupied by the "invisible Church" in the system which the Tracts assailed. While the Tracts present the Church as a visible body, making good its claims by historical proofs, and with living rulers entitled to demand obedience, these systems present us instead with an intellectual abstraction, a Church invisible or universal, connexion with which may confer privileges, but does not impose any restraint on self-will, since there is no living voice to guide or govern. There are many minor points which forty years ago were accounted marks of defective Churchmanship, and which at present are common to men of opposite schools, such as the use of extempore sermons, the introduction of unauthorised hymns into public worship, and general unwillingness to be restrained by the strict letter of the Rubric.* Mr. Bennett, of Frome, not long since published a pamphlet denouncing "that great source of discord which is so unhappily misnamed an 'Act of Uniformity,' as if an Act of Parliament could make religion; as if souls were to be drilled into a set form of worship, as a regiment of soldiers are marched in order on parade." And he goes on to deplore how from that Act resulted the "wandering away of thousands of men from the Church of England," and to mourn over that "St. Bartholomew's day, 1662, when the Church lost about 2000 of her clergy,—some of the most learned among them, as Baxter, —who, rather than be forced by temporal penalties against their conscience, gave up all for God." If a pamphlet on this theme had been published thirty years ago, no one would have hesitated to ascribe it either to a dissenter or to a member of that school in the Church of England whose sympathies are most with Dissent and most alien to the 'Tracts for the Times;' but this language now comes from an enthusiastic admirer of the

* For instance, the claim made by some clergymen of the Evangelical school, of a right to use extempore prayer in the pulpit at the beginning or end of their sermons, is cast into the shade by Mr. Vaux's doctrine ('The Church and the World,' 3rd series, p. 162), that any clergyman who uses the Morning and Evening Prayer as prescribed, has a right to construct for himself additional services by making a cento out of the Bible and Prayer-book, together with hymns. If this be legal, I see nothing to prevent the cento being made extempore.

Tracts, and who has devoted a paper in 'The Church and the World' to expatiating on their happy consequences. I believe that this approximation between opposite schools is not casual, but results from the fact that there are principles common to both. And in this paper I wish to state some of the grounds of my conviction that many who still use the watchword of "Church principles" have in reality forsaken them: that they show no sufficient sense that schism is an evil, much less a sin; and make no proper acknowledgment of the duty of union with the visible Church and of obedience to its authority.

1. And in the first place, I would observe that it is not correct to describe the anti-Roman teaching of the Tracts as a relic of Protestantism inconsistent with their general spirit. The denouncement of Romanism was an essential part of the Tract system, and was declared by Dr. Newman to be necessary to his position. This expression was at the time much criticised, as if it implied that the writer thought it justifiable to use strong language against Rome, of which in his heart he did not approve, because it was necessary to his reputation for Anglican orthodoxy to follow the line which a *consensus* of able and learned divines had taken before him. But first in 'Loss and Gain,'* and afterwards in his 'Apologia,' Dr. Newman explained his meaning to have been that it was necessary to the position of Anglicans not to say of Rome what they *did not* think, but to speak out what they *did* think of her, however harsh and unpleasant it might be. "You must believe that there is something bad, corrupt, perilous in the Church of Rome, that there is a spirit of Antichrist living in her, energizing in her, and ruling in her, or you ought to go to Rome." "You have no leave to trifle with your conviction that Rome is anti-Christian, if you think so. For if it *is* so, it is necessary to *say* so. A poet says, 'Speak *gently* of our sister's *fall*:' no, if it is a fall, we must not speak gently of it." "Those who have given up their protests against Rome either are looking towards her, or have no eyes to see." "Those who resolve to remain in our Church, and are using sweet words of

* The language quoted from 'Loss and Gain' is there put into the mouth of a fictitious character, but is evidently intended as an explanation of what Dr. Newman himself had meant in using those words "necessary to our position," on which charges against his honesty had been founded.

Romanism, will be forced back upon their proper ground in spite of themselves, and will get no thanks for their pains. No man can serve two masters: either go to Rome, or condemn Rome." What, in short, Dr. Newman meant by saying that the protest against Rome is necessary to the position of an Anglican, is that the whole attitude of the Church of England to that of Rome cannot be justified unless the latter has fallen into grave error. It is historically certain that about three hundred years ago a separation and breach of communion took place between the English Church and those who acknowledged obedience to the Bishop of Rome. Since that time the teaching of the Church of Rome has been condemned in the strongest language, not only in the writings of all the leading English divines, but also in the authorised formularies of the Church itself. Thus some of the Roman doctrines and practices are spoken of in the English formularies as "fond things vainly invented," as "what cannot be taught without arrogance and impiety," as "idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians," as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." If our Reformers used such language as this, it was because *they* did not think lightly of the evils of schism; they knew and deeply regretted the mischief which must ensue from the breach of unity between Christian nations, and they chose to incur this evil because the only alternative was submission to what, in their judgment, could not be acquiesced in without sin. It would be no justification to our Reformers if it could be shown that they were right in the matters in dispute between them and the Roman Catholic divines, unless it could be shown that the questions in debate were of vital importance. If, on the occasion of the rejection of some Bill by Parliament, the defeated party were to proceed to civil war, their conduct would not be justified, even if they could show that the measure which they had advocated was expedient, and that it was, on the whole, desirable that the Bill should have passed. To justify their conduct it would plainly be necessary to show that the question in dispute was one of great importance, and that the evils of peaceably acquiescing in the decision of previously established power were so intolerable that the evils of civil war were less.

Hitherto the Church of England has not shrunk from owning her responsibility with respect to the breach of communion that

has taken place between her and the principal Churches of continental Europe. It cannot be denied that union might have been maintained if our Church would acknowledge the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, and would submit to his decisions on points of doctrine. This she refused to do, on the ground that his claim to supremacy was usurped, and that several of his doctrinal decisions were wrong. She has declared that however great the advantages of unity and peace, the claims of vital truth deserve more to be regarded; and that it was impossible for her to maintain unity which could only be preserved by paying to creatures the honour due to Christ alone, and worshipping as God that which she believed not to be God. If our Reformers were right in their opinion of the dangerous and mischievous character of the errors which they assailed, then the Reformation is justified. But if the matters in dispute were trivial—if the differences between the parties arose out of mutual misunderstandings which may now be explained away, then undoubtedly the schism of the last three hundred years was not merely a great mistake, but a great sin.*

But supposing that we own that our fathers were in the wrong in the dispute with Rome, and that the responsibility of the schism rests with them, we have the further question to ask ourselves—May it not follow that Rome is also in the right as to the forfeiture of privileges which that schism incurred? It is assumed that we are the undoubted representatives of the ancient Church of England, and it is proposed that we should in that capacity seek reconciliation with Rome. But it is certain that this claim of ours Rome does not acknowledge. She maintains that by our wilful schism we cut ourselves off from the communion of the Christian Church, and can no longer claim its episcopate or its priesthood. And if she turn out to have been right on so many other points on which our fathers deemed her erroneous, may she not be right also on this? If she be right in charging us with the guilt of schism, may she not be right also as to the penalty with which she declares it to have been visited?

Let us imagine, by way of illustration, that Cromwell had

* I have repeated some things which I published in a tract not likely to have fallen in the way of many of my present readers.

seated himself on the throne of England, and had handed down his dignities to his son. And let us imagine that his descendants, with the enjoyment of regal dignity, had found occasion also to alter their views as to the limitations on Royal prerogatives, would they, on that account, be nearer gaining the hearty allegiance of the ancient Royalists? They might say, "there is no longer any difference between us and you: we recognise the Sovereign's right to levy taxes without consent of Parliament, to give away monopolies, to billet soldiers on the people, to imprison without legal process; and now that we have fully recanted all our father's errors, what obstacle is there to a hearty union between us?"

Surely, the reply would be, that a further proof must be given of the sincerity of these new convictions. "In order that these things should not be done which you now own to be lawful, your fathers deluged England with blood, beheaded our King, drove our Princes into banishment; if you really repent of their crime, do your best to make atonement for it by submission to the true heirs of England's throne; but never imagine that we will acknowledge you as the rightful possessors of the prerogatives of the Sovereign." And this is the very answer that we hear from Roman Catholics, when it is suggested to them that the changed views of many clergy of our Church open now a prospect of reconciliation. Should we now say to them—"That which was once the main point of difference between us and you is now no longer so; the power of the priest to perform a stupendous miracle by the words of consecration is now generally admitted; come into our churches, and you will see visible proofs that our faith is the same as yours, and that our people equally bow in adoration before the corporal presence of Christ on our altars." The answer is—"We rejoice at your change of mind, if it prepares you to acknowledge the powers of the true priest, and makes you ready to worship at the true altars. But as for the presence of Christ on *your* altars, the veriest Protestant cannot go too far in declaring your belief a delusion. Your sanctuaries are empty, your schismatical priesthood is incompetent to confer any supernatural blessing." In short, then, it seems plain that we have only our choice between two courses, either to defend, if we can, the position of our Reformers, that the teaching of Rome included

grievous errors, such as to make our continued union with her impossible; or else, if we cannot do this, frankly to make submission to her—not to wait in the vain hope that the Church of England, as a body, will unite herself with Rome, and that so we can join her with more dignity, and on better terms than if we came singly, but in all humility, as soon as we have discovered our position to be untenable, seek, as individuals, admission into the fold of the only true Church.

It is to me unintelligible how those who teach not only that the matters in dispute between us and Rome may all be easily explained away, but also that the views on these subjects maintained by all the leading divines of the Church of England were false, and that the advocates of the Church of Rome were all along in the right, can think that they may now treat with Rome on equal terms—declare that we find now that our fathers were in error in supposing that there were obstacles such as must keep the Churches apart, and ask that, misunderstandings having now been cleared up, we should return to our ancient friendship. It seems that something more of penitence would become men who came with such a confession. What? we are to come to Rome and say—"We own that we have for the last three hundred years been slandering you. We have misunderstood you and misrepresented you. The charges of blasphemy and idolatry which our divines have brought against your system had no foundation. We are willing, therefore, to admit you to our friendship. The past shall be washed in Lethe and forgotten." If we are to make such a request as this, we must come as suppliants, not as equals. We must come with humble apologies for wrong done, and, before we ask for friendship, entreat for forgiveness. Rome cannot consent to a union on any terms save those of unreserved submission, unless she choose to make a most humiliating confession that she has been guilty of a long course of tyrannical usurpation. To use the words of Father Harper ('Peace through the Truth,' p. lxxix.), the Catholic and Roman Church has been professing for a thousand years—

"That she was *the* Church of Christ; that all Christian bodies, so called, which were not in communion with her, were either schismatics, or heretics, or both; that she was the one infallible Teacher of the Faith; that all jurisdiction over the flock of God flowed from the Chair of Peter; that she was Supreme Judge in matters

of faith and morals. And she has not only professed these truths, but she has unremittingly acted upon them. She has solemnly excommunicated the schismatical Greeks. She has ever treated the Protestant societies (the Anglican included) as not only heretical and schismatical, but as having no orders, and consequently no priesthood, no sacrifice, no altar. She has held during that time eleven Œcumenical Councils, which she pronounces to be of equal authority to the preceding seven. In the last of these she has explicitly anathematized Protestant doctrines, which were embodied in the Thirty-nine Articles, and were the creed of the English so-called Reformation. She has since then defined as a dogma of faith the Immaculate Conception, and denounced as heretics those who venture to disbelieve it. All along she has claimed to herself infallibility, and acted on the claim. And she is now summoned to undo all this, and to retrace her steps. She is invited to make her confession to her two hundred and fifty millions of children throughout the habitable globe, and to say; 'I declared that I was the only Church of Christ: it is not true. I declared that the Greeks were schismatics: it is not true. I treated Anglicans as a schismatical and heretical body, and as having no orders, no priesthood: I did wrong; they are a branch of the Church, and have undoubtedly got the Apostolical succession. I said that there were eighteen Œcumenical Councils: I was wrong; there are only seven that are truly Œcumenical, and therefore of authority. I have virtually condemned the Thirty-nine Articles: I was wrong again; I did not see how conformable they were to the faith of the Primitive Church, from which I had departed. I have defined the Immaculate Conception of Mary the Mother of God to be an article of faith: again I erred; the doctrine (I see now, since I have read the 'Eirenicon') has no foundation in antiquity. I have claimed infallibility. For more than a thousand years I have been acting under a mistake; deciding upon matters of faith, when I had no business to do so. The Anglican Church may err. The Greek Church may err. I, too, the Roman Catholic Church, may err. So we may all err. But make an addition sum of our three errors, Roman, Greek, and Anglican—the product will be an infallible truth. I erred, because I never knew of the Branch-Church theory before. Pardon me, my children, I have been leading you, and multitudes before you, into fatal errors on matters of faith. I have been usurping for centuries a power to which I had no right. I have been the cause of the sad divisions in Christendom by my arrogant pretensions. However, I hope and believe that I was in invincible ignorance.'

"Such is the sort of confession which English Unionists would

invite the Church to make. In fact, every word of it has been, more or less, suggested to our thoughts by Dr. Pusey's 'Eirenicon.' And what is that reward which is to tempt the Catholic Church to stultify herself, and to throw away the traditions of a millenary? It is this, that she may be received into communion by—not the English Establishment (for that, as we shall soon see, is utterly impossible) but by—the Church Union!"

It appears, then, that it is necessary to assert the Protestant character of the Church of England as the only condition on which her position can be maintained. It is historically certain that she *did* protest against Romish error. If she was right in that protest, then she is not responsible for the separation which arose out of it; and nothing has been done to impair her Catholic character, as testified by the unity of her organisation, and the unbroken succession of her bishops and clergy. But if she is ashamed of her protest now, and is forced to withdraw it, and to own that it was made without sufficient cause, then, in ceasing to be Protestant, it is to be feared she ceases to be Catholic too. She remains, then, responsible, and without excuse for the great schism of the last three hundred years, and has only a doubtful claim to a share in the privileges of a Church, from the unity of which she wilfully broke herself off.

On the whole, then, I consider that the great difference between Dr. Newman and his former disciples who have remained in the Church of England is that he has always had an appreciation, which they have not, of the sin and evil of schism. While he could conscientiously maintain that Rome was deeply corrupted with error, he remained a member of the Church of England; when he could no longer defend his protest against Rome he made his submission to her; but he was not so inconsistent as to rail at the Reformation and still remain apart from Rome after he had owned that separation from her had been without excuse.

2. The second point in which I would notice a remarkable change between the tone of the 'Tracts for the Times' and that of the present Ritualistic party, is in their attitude towards the Bishops. One quotation from the Tracts will suffice, since on this subject their teaching is uniform. "Again it may be asked, Who are at this time the successors and spiritual descendants of

the Apostles? I shall surprise some people by the answer I shall give, though it is very clear, and there is no doubt about it; the BISHOPS. They stand in the place of the Apostles, as far as the office of ruling is concerned; and whatever we ought to do, had we lived when the Apostles were alive, the same ought we to do for the Bishops. He that despiseth them despiseth the Apostles. It is our duty to reverence them for their office sake; they are the shepherds of Christ's flock. If we knew them well we should love them for the many excellent graces they possess, for their piety, loving-kindness, and other virtues. But we do not know them; yet still for all this we may honour them as the ministers of CHRIST, without going so far as to consider their private worth, and we may keep to their fellowship as we should to that of the Apostles." Thus it will be observed that the Tracts not only insisted on the value of the Episcopate as the only rightful channel for conveying valid succession to the ministry, but on its importance as the fountain of authority and the centre of unity.

It is in the latter aspect, much more than in the former, that the Episcopal office is presented in Scripture and in the earliest Christian writings. I do not mean to say that the Bishop's right to ordain was doubted, but that his authority to rule was much more strongly insisted on. In those celebrated Ignatian letters which have been so often appealed to in the controversy about Episcopacy, and translations of which were published in the 'Tracts for the Times,' though the power of the Bishop to ordain is no doubt assumed, it is scarcely if at all spoken about; what is perpetually dwelt on is the duty of union with the Bishop, and submission to his authority; the rule Μηδεὶς χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τι πρασσέτω.* In the time of Ignatius, the Bishop ruled

* A writer in 'The Church and the World' (3rd series, p. 51) having first asked the *naif* question, how much of "the work" of the last thirty years could have been done *with* the Bishops, invites us to continue the quotation; "Do nothing without the Bishop, *and be ye also subject to the Priesthood* and to the Apostles of Jesus Christ." This might be relevant if there were any disunion between the Bishops and the body of the priesthood; but not so when the question really is, whether individual presbyters may do that which is right in their own eyes, setting at defiance not only the authority of their Bishop, but also the opinion of the majority of their brethren in the priesthood. In the very next sentence it is owned that the priesthood, as a body, are with the Bishops. "The position which we look on ourselves as occupying at this moment is that of a Constitutional Opposition struggling for the law and for the rights of the people, and threatened, therefore, with all manner of pains and penalties by an Upper House, which is endeavouring

like the queen bee in the hive; at present Bishops are treated like the drones; their existence is recognised as for some mysterious reasons necessary to the continuation of the species, but if they meddle with the working members of the community they are stung without mercy. I could give instances enough of the attacks on Bishops to which I refer. Thus, in the last series of the 'Church and the World' it is maintained that it is right to disobey the Bishops, (p. 19) because they are deficient in learning; (p. 20, &c.) because they are deficient in piety. At p. 23 the inquiry proceeds: "Learning and religion being thus to seek, can we fall back on justice or courtesy?" The proof of these theses is made more *piquant* by individual illustrations: York, p. 23; Carlisle, 15, 23; Gloucester, 19, 25; Ely, 19; St. David's, 23, 28; Peterborough, 23, 25; Durham, 23; Lincoln, 25; Norwich, 47. See also pp. 571-573.

Instead, however, of multiplying examples of my own selection, I prefer to show how Roman Catholics are disgusted at seeing the manner in which men claiming the name and professing to hold the principles of Catholics comply with the precept to obey them who have the rule over them. The following extract from Sweeney's lectures on the nature, the grounds, and the home of faith, is copied from the 'Dublin Review' of July, 1867:—

"As a specimen of the way in which the High Church Unionist party regard the Episcopal office as exercised in the Anglican Church, we would refer to two articles in the 'Church Times.' In this paper appear correspondence and communications from clergymen of note, who adopt the paper as their organ. In the issue for March 9th, 1867, is a leading article against the proposed increase in the Episcopate. The writer says:—'Our objection is, that while Bishops are appointed as now, and *while they behave as now, the fewer we have of them the better.* As matters stand, the mass of correspondence and purely routine business which a Bishop has to get through somehow keeps him fully occupied, and *he has but little leisure for doing mischief.* But there can be no doubt how he would employ

---

to erect itself into an irresponsible oligarchy, and has wheedled, bribed, or terrorized a majority of the Lower Chamber into acquiescence." Here we may accept the admission that the majority of the Lower Chamber is with the Upper, without troubling ourselves to discuss the suggestion that the acquiescence has been the result of wheedling, bribery, or terror.

himself if his tasks were lightened one half. Not in more active visitation, not in theological composition, not in sedulous promotion of practical reforms, but *in bullying those of his clergy who belonged to the unpopular school.*' He then proceeds to give ten qualifications which he deems a Bishop ought to have, and says:—'We should be very well content with a prelate who united in himself even half of these qualifications, but it is not possible to say so much of any prelate now on the English Bench . . . . wherefore we come to the conclusion that the *fewer Bishops like the present we have, the better.* . . .'. What we want is, *not more Bishops, but better ones;* not fresh tyrants, but reins, and curbs for those we have.' Thinking that such an article would at once provoke the burst of indignation which would follow if one of our Catholic papers had written in such a manner, we looked at the next number. Not a word of protest from any one; but to prove that the sentiments expressed on March 9th were not those of the moment merely, the writer returns on March 23rd to the subject, and in a leading article on 'The Situation,' says:—'In point of fact there is probably no class of persons in these realms who enjoy so little public confidence as the Right Rev. Bench. Broad Church utterly contemns Bishops, both the office and the men who hold it; Low Church abhors the office, but tolerates it when it happens to have been conferred upon its own adherents; High Church reveres the office, but—well, we won't say how it regards many of those who in these times have come by sundry "bye-path and indirect crook'd way" to the mitre. The notion, therefore, of the Bishops asking for more power is really one that we cannot bring ourselves to think of with seriousness.' And the article proceeds with urging resistance to the Bishops in case of any law passed by them against the Ritualists, in a spirit which cannot but call for the indignation of Catholics, when they find that those who use such language against the very persons who ordain their ministers, pretend to identify themselves with us. Here again prevails that unreal and delusive theory of distinguishing between the office and those who bear it. As well might a person who was convicted of high treason for injuring the person of his Sovereign justify himself by saying, that he revered the office of royalty, but only attacked the individual who bore it. If the Anglican Church admits that they are in such a position as to be exempt from the obligation of following St. Paul's command when he says, 'Obey your prelates and be subject to them; for they watch, as being to render an account of your souls,' then do let them accept this as sufficient evidence that Anglicanism is not Catholicity. It cannot be said that we are acting unfairly in quoting a newspaper as an authority for a Church party, for we cannot help feeling

that 'silence gives consent,' inasmuch as not a word of protest, as far as we have been able to see, has appeared in the correspondence of the paper against such disloyal language. If an analogous case occurred in one of our Catholic organs, we know how the sensitiveness of the faithful on such a point would universally manifest itself, and denounce the paper as traitorous to the cause of religion."

The number of the 'Dublin Review' for April, 1868, gives other extracts from recent numbers of the 'Church Times,' still more bitter and insulting to the Bishops in general, and the Bishop of London in particular. "We may be told," says the 'Dublin Review' "that no school can fairly be judged by its newspapers, and that the 'Chronicle' though a Catholic paper, did not treat the Holy Father with much reverence. But the material difference is that the 'Chronicle,' though edited with singular ability, came to an end in a few months, because Catholics would not take in a paper, the tone of which offended their loyal instincts. The 'Church Times,' sold at a penny, has at least circulation enough to maintain it for years."

But the 'Dublin Review' does not confine its quotations to anonymous publications. It contrasts Dr. Newman's reverence for his Bishop with modern disregard for Episcopal authority. "All the world remembers some passages in the 'Apologia,' descriptive of his feelings on this subject. 'What to me was *jure divino* was the voice of my Bishop in his own person. My own Bishop was my Pope, I knew no other, the successor of the Apostles, the Vicar of Christ. This continued through my course; and when at length, in 1845, I wrote to Bishop Wiseman, in whose vicariate I found myself, to announce my conversion, I could find nothing better to say to him than that I would obey the Pope as I had obeyed my own Bishop in the Anglican Church. My duty to him was my point of honour; his disapprobation was the one thing I could not bear.' Those who best knew him while in the Church of England well remember how absolutely all this was matter, not of words, but of acts and of the heart. A modern Ritualist, on the contrary, seems to us to regard a Bishop merely as 'a man who has been lucky in his profession' (to adopt a well-known phrase of S. G. O.), 'who by the act of the Church has the power of conferring orders, and as an instrument of the State is invested

with certain legal powers.'" Dr. Newman's tone is then contrasted with that of Mr. Nugee's answers when examined before the Ritual Commission. "He tells us that some of his parishioners sent a memorial to the Bishop, who wrote to ask him, 'What does it all mean?—will you tell me?' I wrote back simply stating, that, of course, as my spiritual father, I was bound to listen to his monition, which I was prepared to do. I said that if he would kindly write to me in a letter as to anything which I did which was abnormal or illegal in the Church, I would tell his Lordship exactly what I should do. I said I should send it to Sir Robert Phillimore, and abide by his decision." Thus it would seem that the duty of obedience to one's spiritual father, is satisfied by "listening to his monition" and complying with it *if* Sir Robert Phillimore certifies that the Bishop has legal power to compel obedience. On these principles Mr. Spurgeon or Dr. Cumming could without difficulty take an oath of obedience to the Pope, meaning thereby that he would obey any of the Pope's commands which he had legal power to enforce.

Finally, Mr. Bennett is quoted in the 'Dublin Review' as informing the Ritual Commission that he did not think it necessary to consult the Bishop on questions of ritual; and although "on trivial or immaterial things you would naturally follow the Bishop's advice, if they were important things, such as vestments, the Bishop would have no authority." In cases in which there was an appeal to the Bishop, and from him to the Archbishop, Mr. Bennett conceived that there is a further appeal to the Church in synod assembled, in which the whole Church might speak, and not one individual. "An Anglican," says the 'Dublin Review,' "has only to judge his Bishop a heretic, in order to convince himself that he owes obedience no longer to him, but to some imaginary future general council, and meanwhile to the Primitive Church—that is to his own opinion of its judgment—that is to himself. And thus obedience to Ecclesiastical superiors really is on his theory a duty only so long as he agrees with them; and when he ceases to agree with them, his obedience is transferred to himself."

But Mr. Bennett is even more than practically a Presbyterian; one is surprised to find reproduced in his 'Plea for Toleration,' the stock arguments of theoretical Presbyterians. He brings

forward the oft-cited assertion of St. Jerome, that originally Bishops and Presbyters were the same, and that the superiority of the Bishop is derived rather from Church custom than from our Lord's appointment; and he quotes with approbation the commentary on this passage made by Hooker, by whose opinion "all classes of Church people would agree to be bound." Hooker's view, apparently put forward with some hesitation, is that the Church has power for reason good to alter even the positive laws of the Apostles if there be no divine command to the contrary; and accordingly, that Episcopacy, though instituted by the Apostles, *might* be abolished by the Church Universal. In this way he reconciles St. Jerome's assertion that Episcopacy rests on the custom of the Church, with the earlier tradition that it is derived from the Apostles; because, though apostolically instituted, yet not being divinely commanded, it might be rejected if the custom of the Church did not support it. And then follow the words which Mr. Bennett quotes with special approbation: "On the other side, Bishops, albeit they may avouch with conformity of truth that their authority hath thus descended even from the very Apostles themselves, yet the absolute and everlasting continuance of it they cannot say that any commandment of the Lord doth enjoin; and therefore must acknowledge that the Church hath power by universal consent upon urgent cause, to take it away, if thereunto she be constrained through the proud, tyrannical, and unreformable dealings of her Bishops, whose regimen she hath thus long delighted in because she hath found it good and requisite to be so governed." I have my doubts whether Mr. Bennett fully apprehended the meaning of this passage, in which it seems to me that an apology is indicated for the formation of non-episcopal communities in foreign countries where the Bishops proved "unreformable."

I suppose Mr. Bennett to have overlooked the tendency of some of the passages he quotes with approbation, because I take for granted he holds the necessity of Apostolical succession transmitted by Episcopal ordination, in order to the validity of certain rites. This latter doctrine, however, is now taught by some in a form which strikes me as thoroughly schismatical. The Church of England, in the 23rd Article, asserts that no one can lawfully take upon him the office of ministering the

Sacraments who has not been lawfully called and sent by men who have public authority given them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard. Notwithstanding the generality of these words, we may gather from the Ordination Service and its preface that, in the mind of our Church, the Bishops are the persons who have this public authority given them to send other ministers into the Lord's vineyard. But clearly the Article rests the right of a priest to administer the Sacraments on his being the duly commissioned officer of the existing Church. The theory to which I refer loses sight completely of the existing Church; the priest has only to look to the Bishop from whom he has derived his gift, and to the line which connects him with the Apostles. If that line be unbroken the commission is valid, though the whole Church repudiate it. The Bishop may be a Bishop of Iona dropped from the clouds, or he may be one of two or more rival claimants to authority over the same Church. This theory has no difficulty in recognising any number of Bishops in the same Church. Each Bishop has received his gift as a private possession, which he may transmit to whomsoever he pleases. Thus on this system the Church is not an organised body, a tree whose different branches are united in a common stock, but it is a congeries of independent twigs, each professing to derive a life of its own by a separate channel from the roots. The whole conception seems to me essentially schismatical.

3. The third note of schism which I would point out is the complete practical denial of the Church's power to decree rites and ceremonies. At the time of the appointment of the Ritual Commission earnest appeals were made to moderate men not to create a schism in the Church by abridging in any point the liberty which her ministers enjoy. It was threatened that if the use of the vestments were declared to be illegal, or if the Church by a new law forbade their use, numbers would leave our Communion, and the Church would sustain such a loss as she met with in the secession of the Wesleyans. Now the question what garb the clergyman should wear in his ministrations is one of those things in their own nature unimportant, which in different times and places have varied, and which ought plainly to be determined, not by the taste of the officiating

minister, but by the authority of the Church to which he belongs. To threaten to leave the Church rather than submit to the decision of lawful authority on such a point as this is the language of men who regard schism with indifference.* If a soldier were to tell his Colonel: "Don't give me such and such commands, for if you do I'll desert," it would be exactly the same as if he flatly refused to obey a command actually given.

But besides these threats of hypothetical disobedience there are enough of instances of existing rubrics violated, and of new rubrics instituted on private authority, to justify the charge I have brought. These variations from established order are defended by antiquarian researches into the pre-Reformation use of the Church of England to which it is assumed the present use must conform. But this argument implicitly denies the Church's power to alter her regulations from time to time, a power claimed by the Church of Rome as much as by the Church of England. No stronger example need be produced than the rule of Communion in one kind, with regard to which the Church of Rome owns that her mode of administering the sacrament differs from that used by Christ Himself at its institution, and from that which prevailed in the Primitive Church, yet claims the power to make the alteration. We need not discuss whether in this particular case that Church has not exceeded its power; but plainly, unless God's commands have

* In the last series of 'The Church and the World,' p. 555, different counsel is given, but not more loyal to Church authority. It is decided that, supposing Parliament were to pass a Bill forbidding the use of vestments, lights, and incense in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, *and this Bill were to be sanctioned by Convocation*, it would be the duty of Catholics not to secede, but simply to disobey. "Secession and obedience are equally out of the question." Those who should take this advice would find themselves in the enviable position of Bishop Colenso—officers of a Church to which, in the judgment of the vast majority of its members they would be disloyal, but trusting that legal difficulties might prevent their being dispossessed. The grounds of the decision are, that it is *ultra vires* of a Provincial Synod "to declare a doctrine or condemn or abolish a practice clearly allowed by the 'Primitive Church' and 'the undisputed General Council'" (*sic*). It is to be hoped that a Provincial Synod may, without impropriety, declare a doctrine clearly allowed by the Primitive Church. But with regard to a practice or a ceremony, the very schismatical principle of which I complain is, the denial of the assertion of the Thirty-fourth Article, that "every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying." It would practically amount to deciding that no ceremony should ever be altered, if authority which could fairly claim to be that of the Church Universal were required for every change.

limited the Church's power, she has a right inherent in her very constitution as a society to make regulations from time to time for the government of her members. Those seem to me to have the very lowest idea of Church authority who dare not put one step forward without justifying it by ancient precedent. One is reminded of the conduct of some *parvenu* who has forced his way into a sphere of life to which he was not born, and for which his previous habits have in no way trained him. He is under perpetual constraint, and is nervously afraid of doing something unfashionable; he searches in a book of etiquette for rules to govern every particular of his behaviour, and is persuaded that if he were ever to act freely and follow his own instincts, he would be sure to commit himself by doing something "ungenteel." But one who is sure of his position is delivered from this bondage; without an effort he conforms to the rules current in the society in which he has been accustomed to live, yet he has no scruple to make a precedent should circumstances require it, and has no apprehension that he will cease to be counted a gentleman, even if he cannot find a pattern for his dress in any tailor's book of fashions. Neither the Church of Rome nor the Church of England shows any signs of this timidity. They each have faith in their own powers, and feel that while they naturally conform to the older practices if there be no reason for deviating from them, they can safely strike into new paths and take a course of their own should expedience so require.

At the time of the Reformation the Church of England wisely decided that she could not continue to use prayers in a language not understood by the people, and so far, for good reason, forsook the customs then prevailing in the Church. Yet in the formation of her vernacular Liturgy, she did not consider that the task set before her was the construction of a completely new Service. On the contrary, she took the Service actually in use for some hundreds of years in the English Church, translated it into English, omitting or altering those things then found in it which savoured of error or superstition, but retaining the substance and the general framework unaltered. Commentators on the Prayer-book have pointed out how, in every part of her Service, she has followed primitive models, and for the most part the model of the Ancient English

Church. Yet sometimes they have shewn themselves, in my judgment, over anxious to establish a complete correspondence between our own and ancient practice, and strained some little points in a way that would seem to indicate they thought our Church needed justification if she ventured on anything ceremonial for which she could not produce a precedent. For example, I would prefer to confess that the recital of the Ten Commandments in the Communion Service is a peculiarity of the English ritual, than to contend with Palmer, that the reading of a lesson from the Old Testament was customary in the Ancient Church; and that, therefore, the Church of England was justified in appointing an Old Testament Lesson taken permanently from the Book of Exodus, and not varying from Sunday to Sunday, to be read in this part of her Service. This account of the matter was repeated in the first edition of the 'Directorium Anglicanum;' but in the second edition the Editor acknowledges the weakness of this plea, and confesses with tears that the introduction of the Ten Commandments here is a singular and grievous innovation for which no justification can be found.

It would be easy to produce other examples of the same kind. Those who give their allegiance to a dead Church instead of a living one, adopt a system which admits of no elasticity, and are governed by rules which are founded on principles admitting no intelligible justification. They tell us, for instance, that such and such are the only admissible materials for an altar-cloth; such and such the only legitimate colours. If this were laid down as a rule by the existing Church, I am satisfied to submit without asking reasons. The king commands —"nil ultra quæro plebeius." But when an unauthorized person requires me to observe the same rule, I naturally ask for reasons; and I find nothing better than what some slave of fashion might give for thinking it shocking to wear a dress cut in some unusual way. She shakes her head, and says "It is not worn so;" but why it is not, or why it might not be, she would find it impossible to tell. The fact is, it is idle for us now to say,—"We will belong to the Church of the fifteenth century." We have been born in the nineteenth century, and to the Church of that century we must belong, or to none at all. If we insist on going back,

we may as well go back to the first century as to the fifteenth. "It is all the same whether a man refuse to comply with Church regulations because in his judgment they are not the wisest that could be devised, or because he finds that in former days different regulations were in force. Without insisting on the claims of the Church as a Divine Society, we may at least expect that she shall receive as much obedience from her members as must be given by the members of any human society where men combine for a common object, as is given by the members of a cricket club or chess club. Imagine a chess player who one day rejected the present rules and insisted on playing according to the rules of Philidor's time; then, if we had yielded to him in this, the next week carrying his researches further back and requiring us to conform to the mediæval Italian code; and if we had gratified him thus far, in another week's time, as he extended his antiquarian researches, demanding our compliance with the rules of the game as practised in the East in ancient times; and I think we should come to the conclusion that so very arbitrary a person had better play by himself, and not expect that others should conform to his whims. And I do not think the illustration in the least exaggerates the changeableness and uncertainty of the self-imposed antiquarian code the rules of which vary not only from one church to another, but which are even in any one church in a perpetual state of alteration, as the restorers of ancient practices extend their reading, and as their courage to throw existing rubrics overboard increases. In fact it is made a reproach to a church now if its ritual remains for a few years without alteration. In the second series of 'The Church and the World' Mr. Bennett complains that "S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and S. Barnabas', Pimlico, though among the first churches of the western part of London in setting forth the teaching of the Tracts, and though nobly and bravely bearing the brunt of the battle of the World from 1850 to 1857, since that time have made the least progress in advancing the Church order and ritual. And the same may be said of All Saints', Margaret Street; first in the movement when in a poor misshapen room in Margaret Street Mr. Oakeley presided over it, and the Catholic usages of the church drew crowds of worshippers to learn and to adore what then was a novelty, still this church is

equally remarkable with S. Paul's and S. Barnabas' for making no advance."

I have no desire to see a code established of unbending uniformity, so that the Church's Service should be at all times, and at all places, absolutely the same. We must accept it as a fact that, according to men's differences in intellectual and æsthetic culture, their tastes differ exceedingly. What to one seems noble and grand simplicity, to another seems dry, cold, poor; what to one seems gorgeous and impressive, is condemned by another as meretricious, childish, sensual. It is true Christian wisdom to make the accessories of religion attractive to the people to whom it is offered; attractive in the way their tastes demand. At present our Church's rules allow of considerable diversity, nor should I object to see greater latitude on some points permitted by lawful authority. But I do object to each priest's being permitted to select from antiquity a ritual for himself uncontrolled either by rubric or by the authority of his ordinary. Public worship could not be conducted if the people shewed as little regard for the wishes of the clergyman as he sometimes does for theirs. He may choose that the Litany shall be sung, but how can it be sung if each person insists on singing to a tune of his own? There have been sneers in abundance at the "aggrieved parishioner;" but it is surely a real practical grievance that the clergyman should have power to revolutionize the services of his church in a manner most distasteful and offensive to his congregation, and that they should have no remedy unless they choose to turn God's house into a bear garden, and His service into brawling and contention.*

* Since the above was written it has received a striking illustration from the letter in which Mr. Hubbard, the patron and founder of the Church of St. Alban, Holborn, "challenges the sympathy and assistance" of his Bishop because of the "persistent introduction of strange and obsolete practices" by an incumbent who, at the time of his appointment, had given Mr. Hubbard an "earnest assurance of his wish to carry on the work in accordance with his desire as far as he possibly could," and of his endeavour "to act as a true and faithful priest of the Church of England with prudence and discretion." The language with which Mr. Hubbard closes his letter to the Bishop of London is nearly identical with that employed in the text: "In these days it would be as impolitic as unjust to narrow the liberty of either the clergy or the laity of our Church; but liberty must not degenerate into licence. No Church, no corporation, no society can exist without order and without law; and it must be decided whether, consistently with order, law, and the uniformity which results from them, individuals can be permitted to act independently of all authority and opinion but their own."

Public sympathy is now generally against any interference of authority with individual liberty; but this is a matter where the liberty of the clergyman is the slavery of the people. If he be exempted from all control of rubric or Bishop, the people must either acquiesce in what they will often regard as a total change of the religion taught in their church, or else absent themselves from the houses where they and their fathers have been wont to worship, and their right to a continued use of which, on the same terms, is involved in the very notion of an Establishment.

It is no wonder, then, that an Establishment should not be in favour with the party of which I am speaking, and that they should express their desire to see the Church relieved from the fetters which State connexion imposes on it. But I am persuaded that when the matter is examined into, it will be found that what is really objected to is often not limitations imposed by the State on Church authority, but the power, limited as it is, which State connexion gives to Church officers to enforce obedience. The ideal of many is a Church completely on the voluntary system, where the priest, supported by liberal offertories from his congregation, should be absolutely uncontrolled by any external authority. If a Bishop thoroughly agree with him, he will gladly accept so respectable a leader; if the Bishop disapprove of his proceedings, he does not desire to trouble himself about him, unless he happen to want ordination for a curate. This conception, however, could only be carried out on the system of the Independents; for if the Church of England, though separated from the State, were to remain together as one body, it is probable that the vote of a considerable majority would impose on individual liberty restrictions quite as severe as any which the law of the land imposes at present. I cannot help branding as schismatical a conception which reduces the Church from an organised body to a mere name for a collection of independent Presbyters, each teaching and acting as he pleases. One is reminded of Lord Amberley's proposal of an Established Church, completely relieved from the incumbrance of creeds, each of whose teachers was left completely free, and in which, if I remember right, even the existence of a God was to be an open question.

The toleration taught by some of the Ritualist divines resembles much more the latitudinarianism of Lord Amberley than the comprehensiveness of Christian charity. They tell us that they only claim the right to wear chasubles themselves, but have no wish to force their neighbour to do so against his conscience. They have no desire to persecute or to turn others out of the Church. "We look on the Church as a great hospital, meant for the cure of all spiritual ailments, and especially for that zymotic disorder called Protestantism. The prospect of cure within the walls is, we believe, far greater than it is for out-patients, and therefore while not willing to relax unduly the necessary regulations of the house, we should never think of turning out some poor *cretin* whose faculties allow him to count up to exactly Thirty-nine Articles and no more." ('The Church and the World,' third series, p. 66.) No one understands the first principles of toleration, who holds that all who do not agree with himself must be either idiots or knaves. I reverence the toleration which springs from Christian charity, which can recognise in men of other theological schools real love for Christ and zeal for His cause, and can therefore cheerfully own them as brethren, because it is felt that the points of agreement are vastly more important than those of difference. But I have no respect for the toleration which springs from indifference or from weakness. If you refuse to own men as brethren, if you treat them as deniers of vital truth, if, when you acquit them of wilful dishonesty, you insultingly excuse them on the ground of intellectual feebleness or stupid ignorance, and yet are content that they should remain authorised teachers of the same Church as yourself, it cannot but be thought that the reason either is, because you are not strong enough to enforce as you would wish the "necessary regulations of the house," or because you are indifferent to the organic unity of the Church, and, provided you can keep your own conventicle open to teach in it what you believe to be truth, are not concerned in what is taught by others, with whom, though nominally your fellow-presbyters, you have no real connexion.

I could give other illustrations of the prevalence of schismatical tendencies at the present day; but I content myself with those which I have produced: namely, that men who speak with contempt and abhorrence of the Reformers and

the Reformation, quietly remain in the position in which the Reformation placed them, and seem unconscious that a causeless breach of the Church's unity can be visited with any penalties: that they transfer their allegiance from living Bishops to dead ones, who give very little trouble, who will speak exactly when they are required to speak, and will make no remonstrance when they are neglected: and that they act as if they supposed the power of instituting rites and ceremonies to belong not to the Church, but to each individual clergyman. Men who act thus are most unfairly accused of Romanizing tendencies, because none are less likely than they to submit themselves to the Church of Rome, which they could not join without exchanging self-will for obedience, and coming under the dominion of a fixed code instead of being allowed to devise one for themselves.

George Salmon.

ESSAY IX.

THE REVISIONS OF THE LITURGY CONSIDERED IN THEIR BEARING ON RITUALISM.

By W. G. HUMPHRY, B.D.,

Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, London; late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

1. Former controversies on Ritual comparatively unimportant, as not involving doctrine.

2. The present movement opens various questions, æsthetic, historical, and legal:

3. But turns mainly on doctrine.

4. Distinction between preaching a doctrine and enforcing it by ceremonies. Appeal to the Liturgy.

5. I.—As to the doctrine of the objective presence. Statement of the doctrine. Authorities for and against it.

6. Prayer-book of 1549 compared with the Missal: (1) Prayer of Consecration; (2) Elevation and Adoration.

7. Prayer-book of 1552:—(1) Prayer of Consecration modified. Illustration from the Office of Baptism. (2) New form of administration; (3) Removal of expressions implying the local presence—(*a*) The third Exhortation. (*b*) The first Exhortation. (*c*) The prayer of humble access. (*d*) The post-Communion prayers. (4) The "black Rubric."

8. II.—As to the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The doctrine variously expressed by divines of our Church. The chasuble used as an outward expression of it. The term "propitiatory sacrifice" open to objection.

9. The doctrine recognised in the Book of 1549. (1) Prayer of Consecration altered in 1552. (2) Prayer for Church militant, change in 1552. (3) The word "altar" retained in 1549, removed in 1552. (4) The word "mass" likewise removed in 1552. (5) Directions given in 1549, 1552, and 1662 as to the position of the priest. (6) The "north side." (7) Use of the word "priest."

10. General effect of the changes since 1549. Conclusion.

THE REVISIONS OF THE LITURGY,

CONSIDERED IN THEIR BEARING ON RITUALISM.

I.—THE English Church, since the Reformation, has been sorely troubled by questions relating to the vesture of the Clergy and other external accessories of Divine service. These questions, however unimportant they may have been in themselves, were debated with as much warmth as if they concerned the essentials of religion; and they led to schisms which have never been entirely healed. The ritualistic movement of the present day has also to do with externals; but it involves matters of much greater consequence. It seeks to bring back into use rites and ceremonies which have long been disused, for the avowed purpose of inculcating a certain form of doctrine. Though by no means a complete definition of the movement, this would probably be allowed, both by its advocates and its opponents, to be a fair description of its most distinctive and most serious aspect.

Compare for a moment the present controversy with those which have borne most resemblance to it in former times. For more than a century after the establishment of the reformed ritual, there continued to be a feverish state of feeling with regard to rites and ceremonies. The surplice was vehemently denounced by a party in the Church as a "rag of popery;" the use of the sign of the cross in baptism was looked upon as an idolatrous practice, or stigmatised as "a sacrament of human institution;" the giving of the ring in matrimony was said to be either frivolous or superstitious; the custom of kneeling at the reception of the Holy Communion was charged with being an adoration of the consecrated elements. But the objection to these and other usages was founded rather upon a blind prejudice, or a vague suspicion, than on an intelligent appreciation of their proper purpose: while it was never asserted in their defence that they symbolised a particular doctrine, or that they were anything more than good old customs, worthy to be retained because of their antiquity, or because they contributed to give

beauty and solemnity to the public worship of Almighty God. The only case in which there could be fair ground for the imputation of a doctrinal meaning was the kneeling of the communicants at the Lord's table; but in that case the doctrinal meaning was disclaimed, and to prevent misapprehension, the "black rubric," as it has been called, was added, in 1552, at the end of the Communion Service. The controversy was renewed with fresh virulence from time to time; but the stoutest adversaries of ceremonial must have been convinced at last that no use was made of the objectionable rites for the propagation of objectionable doctrine.

A few ceremonies indeed there were, expressive of doctrine, which, having been allowed to remain in the first Prayer-book of Edward VI., were afterwards omitted. Such were the use of the chrism and the unction in baptism. They were dropped, however, not from a dislike of their doctrinal significance, for it does not appear that any objection was made to them on that account, but because they were obnoxious as ceremonies. They fared the fate of other parts of the old ritual, which never were shibboleths of doctrine, such as the Office used once a month for the benediction of the fresh water placed in the font, and the use of the sign of the cross in that and other Services, especially in the Order of the Holy Communion, at Confirmation, and at Matrimony.

Within our own time the surplice has again become a subject of controversy and a sign of division. Its use in the pulpit was resumed, not because it symbolised a dogma, but because it was considered to be the proper and prescribed dress of the preacher: it was objected to as indicating the leaning of those who wore it towards the so-called "Tractarian" party in the Church. And whether the resumption of it as the preacher's garb be considered judicious or not, whether rubrics and canons be cited for or against it, whether or not, on the grounds of a true symbolism, it be thought appropriate in the pulpit, no one probably would now contend that its recommendation, or its offence, consists in its being the exponent of any particular doctrine.

II.—But it is not so with the usages which, within the last few years, have been systematically revived, and which are included

under the name of Ritualism. They are attacked, and they are defended, on various grounds.

1. On the æsthetic ground it is urged that they are tawdry, that they are frivolous, that they tend to divert the thoughts of the worshipper from the essentials to the accessories of religion; that they are not consistent with the simplicity which is the most becoming, the most solemn, and the most dignified mode of conducting Divine worship. On the other hand, it is said in their defence, that the taste for ornament has been greatly developed of late years, that it shows itself in the decoration of our private houses and public buildings, and in the greater attention paid to the fine arts; that this taste for ornament has naturally extended from the scenes of domestic and civil life to our holy places, that no expense is now spared in adorning the material edifice of the church, and that the few and simple accessories of Divine service, which satisfied the eye and ear a few years ago, are now felt to be cold and repulsive, and the usages which have lately been revived, if by some they are offensively styled "sensuous" and "sensational," are to others the "beauty of holiness," and are valued by them as an useful and almost a necessary aid to their devotion.

2. On the historical ground it is alleged against the new ritual that it is derived from the Church of Rome, that on that account, if on no other, it is highly offensive to all faithful children of our Reformed Church, that it will inevitably lead those who become attached to it to go further and seek its full development in the communion from which it is borrowed. To this it is replied that the revived ritual is not of Roman origin, but Catholic and primitive; and that even if it were derived from Rome, that would not be a sufficient reason for taking offence at it; that it has nothing of a "Romanising" tendency, but may rather be expected to arrest and satisfy those who are in danger of being attracted towards the Church of Rome merely by the splendour of its ceremonial.

3. On the legal ground it is contended by the one party that the rites and ornaments in question were at the Reformation prohibited by law; and that even if this were not the case, they were laid aside at that epoch, and have become entirely obsolete, and the disuse of them is so complete as to amount to a pro-

hibition of their revival — *mos pro lege*. The other party maintain that they never were prohibited, that they are not so obsolete as has been supposed, and that they may lawfully be revived, even if they are not of legal obligation.

III.—But passing by all these conflicting views, upon each of which there has been much discussion without any near approach to an agreement, we come to another aspect of the matter, in which both sides seem to concur. It is acknowledged that the tendency of these practices is to exalt the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and the especial object of some of them is to symbolise and to enforce certain doctrines relating to that holy Sacrament, viz., the doctrine of the local or objective presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements after consecration, and the doctrine of the "Eucharistic Sacrifice," meaning by that phrase an oblation made by the priest of the consecrated elements.

The most respectable advocates of ritualism have earnestly protested that it is not on mere æsthetic or antiquarian grounds, or in obedience to an obsolete and somewhat ambiguous rubric, that they are provoking so much suspicion and prejudice, and running the risk of producing a serious crisis, perhaps a schism, in the Church. A deeper principle, they say, is involved: doctrines are at stake, which, though held by the Church, are not, cannot be, properly expressed in her Offices, while those external signs and tokens are neglected. Thus it is said by the Rev. James Skinner ('Plea for the Threatened Ritual,' 1865, p. 21), speaking of these ceremonies, "They are the witnesses of momentous truth, or they are nothing. They are no mere accidents of religion. They belong to the very substance of religion. They are not the mere adjuncts and decorations of religion. They are the natural and spontaneous exhibition of religion. The ancient vestments of the priest bespeak the dignity and holiness of his commission from God. The two lights before the Sacrament bespeak the presence of Him who is God and Man, and the very Light of the world. The incense bespeaks the sweetness which that Presence sheds on the one hand, and the sweetness of the odour of intercession on the other. . . . Once get hold of this—that you are fighting for no barren forms and earthly pageantry, however ancient, still less

for the mere badges of a separate opinion, howsoever creditably maintained. It is not their antiquity which commends the 'ornaments' and ceremonies, as if things must be suitable for the 19th century *because* they were used in the 13th; nor is it the fervour of individual minds, however holy and learned, which commends them, as if sentiment and enthusiasm must be irresistible."

So, again, the Rev. W. J. Bennett says ('The Church and the World,' 1867, p. 13):—"Now the ancient vestments present to crowds of worshippers the fact that here before God's Altar is something far higher, far more awful, more mysterious than aught that man can speak of, namely, the Presence of the Son of God in human Flesh subsisting. And towards this are tending all the ancient rites of the Church, which are now in course of restoration. The solemn music, and the smoke of the incense, go up before God, assuring the world that here is no appearance only of love, but a reality and a depth which human hearts cannot fathom, nor even the angels themselves. The incense is the Mediation of Jesus ascending from the Altar to plead for the sins of men." And again, in his evidence before the Ritual Commission ('First Report,' p. 84), Mr. Bennett, in answer to the question "Of what do you consider the two lights to be significant?" says, "Of the living Saviour, His two natures." Q. "In the Sacrament, or out of the Sacrament?" A. "In the Sacrament." And so the late Mr. Keble, a name never to be mentioned without affection and gratitude, said, in a letter published in the 'Guardian' newspaper, Jan. 24, 1866, "I take for granted that the usages in question symbolise more or less directly the doctrine of the Real Presence and Sacrifice."*

On the other hand, there can be no doubt that a large number of the well-informed and (as yet) well-affected clergy and laity of the Church have taken alarm at these ceremonies, not merely as unauthorised innovations, leading, and perhaps intended to lead, in the direction of Rome, by the craving which they encourage for a sensuous religion, but because in these ceremonies they see an emphatic assertion of doctrines, which, so far from being asserted, are purposely omitted and suppressed in the formularies of the Church. It may be consistent with loyalty

* See *infra*, p. 279, and the 'Charge of the Bishop of Llandaff, for 1866,' p. 74.

to his Church that a clergyman should hold the doctrines, and should even teach and preach them, so long as he does this only on his own individual responsibility. But by means of dumb symbols to make these doctrines pervade the Liturgy from which they have been studiously excluded by our Reformers, is, in the opinion of the persons of whom we now speak, to lay again upon the necks of the people a yoke which the Church has taken away, and, *pro tanto*, to undo the work of the Reformation.

IV.—The distinction between the liberty of preaching a doctrine and the liberty of introducing it into the Service of the Church, has been recently urged by the Bishop of Oxford,* who says, "I do not hold that the liberty of introducing unusual rites into the Church stands in the least on the same footing as the liberty of preaching doctrine. Now, that is an important distinction, and one which the persons concerned seem to me to forget. When a ritual long established, and standing on the *mos pro lege* principle, is altered in a church, it is not only that the man who does it advances his views as a teacher of the Church, but taking advantage of his position to make actual manual alterations in the service, he makes all the congregation of the church who acquiesce in these alterations parties with him in his particular view; and there must be a distinction between the larger license given in preaching, and the smaller license given in any alteration of an existing ritual."

The reasonableness of this distinction is obvious. When a man speaks in the pulpit, he is understood to speak under grave responsibility indeed, but still as an individual minister; and the hearer who thinks him to be in error, however much he may be offended at the doctrine, does not consider that he becomes partaker in the error by merely listening to it. But a great hardship is inflicted on the Communicant, who is obliged to view the Church's service, in which he joins himself, through a distorted medium, by means of unusual rites symbolising a doctrine, which the Church, as he believes, has repudiated. It seems to him that he cannot take part in the Service without consenting to false doctrine: and thus he feels that he is subjected to a refined sort of persecution, and practically excommunicated.

* In a Speech in Convocation, Feb. 1868, reported in the 'Chronicle of Convocation,' Sessions Feb. 1868, p. 1154.

Such being the state of the case, it becomes a matter of great importance to ascertain what our Liturgy really teaches as to the objective or local presence, and the Eucharistic sacrifice; whether or not it treats those doctrines in such a manner as to justify the prominence given to them by the use of the symbolical ceremonies which are the subject of so much contention.

To this question I shall now address myself, and in so doing shall consider the alterations made in the Communion Service since its first publication, so far as they have a bearing on the subject before us.

V.—First, as to the local presence of Christ in the consecrated elements. Before we proceed to examine the teaching of the Liturgy with reference to this doctrine, it may be well to say a few words as to the doctrine itself. It cannot, perhaps, be more distinctly stated than in the language of one who holds it, and has lately treated of it ('Tracts for the Day,' p. 232):—"What was done in the Incarnation is renewed in the Sacrament, not in the same manner, but in a certain resemblance and proportion. It has been said that Christ incarnates himself in each worthy communicant, because he unites his sacred flesh to ours, and in a real and true sense makes himself one with us. Lest this should be thought to indicate only a subjective union, consequent upon the ardent faith and devotion of the receiver, there is an antecedent union altogether external to the communicant himself, upon which the other is dependent; for in order to this union of the flesh of Christ with ours, He first incarnates himself in the hands of the priest, *i. e.*, at the moment of consecration Christ unites Himself, Body, Soul, and Divinity, in an ineffable manner, with the elements of bread and wine; and so near does this approach to the Divine and Human in the Incarnation, that Bishop Andrews calls it 'a kind of hypostatical union of the sign and the thing signified, so united together as are the two natures of Christ'" (Sermon 16, on the Nativity). And again (p. 240), "There would be no virtue in receiving the outward part, were it not for the union, almost hypostatic, which joins it to the body and blood of Christ, the reality or substance of the Sacrament. The union once formed by consecration, they become inseparable. The one cannot be received without the other. There is such a thing as unprofitable reception,

when the Sacrament is received without proper disposition and suitable preparation. And there is such a thing as unworthy communion, so strongly denounced by St. Paul, when it is either received in mortal sin, or without discerning the Lord's body. But the consequence of either kind of unworthiness is not that we receive the sign without the thing signified—the sacrament without the substance—but that we receive both; in the one case to condemnation, and in the other without the 'benefits.' But there would be no such guilt were the Lord's body not present, nor any risk of such guilt, were not the outward parts so closely united as to render the profanation of the Lord's body inevitable on the part of unworthy receivers."

It is only perhaps within the last fifteen or twenty years that the term "objective," or "real objective" presence has been used to express this doctrine; but there can be no doubt that, under whatever name, and with whatever differing shades of meaning, it has been held by many of our best divines in successive ages from the Reformation to the present day. We cannot have a higher authority on this point than the learned and candid Bishop of St. David's, who says,* "The Church of England asserts the mystery inherent in the institution of the Sacrament, but abstains from all attempts to investigate or define it, and leaves the widest range open to the devotional feelings and the private meditations of her children with regard to it. And this liberty is so large, and has been so freely used, that, apart from the express admission of Transubstantiation, or of the grossly carnal notions to which it gave rise, and which in the minds of the common people are probably inseparable from it, I think there can hardly be any description of the Real Presence, which in some sense or other is universally allowed, that would not be found to be authorized by the language of eminent divines of our Church; and I am not aware, and do not believe, that our most advanced ritualists have, in fact, overstepped those very ample bounds."

Nor can it be denied that an equally strong array of venerable names may be produced in opposition to the notion of Christ's corporal presence in the bread and wine. Thus Hooker puts the question, "Whether, when the Sacrament

* 'Charge to the Clergy, &c., 1866,' p. 97.

is administered, Christ be wholly within man only, or else His body and blood be also externally seated in the consecrated elements themselves?" And in answer to that question he says, "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receivers of the Sacrament." This view is taught in some of our most esteemed theological manuals, as in that of the Bishop of Ely on the Thirty-nine Articles, where he says, "Though we acknowledge Christ's presence, and not only acknowledge but rejoice in it, yet we hold not that presence to be in the material bread."* A large portion of the clergy and of the thoughtful laity of the Church are strongly attached to this doctrine, and will not readily be induced to relinquish it. "Present in the heart, not in the hands," has been their belief all their life long; and they will not conform to the new reading, "Present in the hands, as in the heart," much as they may respect the piety and the earnestness of those who invite them to make the change.

We are not now advocating this doctrine to the disparagement of that which underlies the ritualistic ceremonial. We are content to take lower ground, and to plead for it, that it is entitled to a continuance of the recognition, we say not sanction, which it has received in our Church for the last three hundred years; that it ought not to be thrust out by the action of individual ministers, in contravention of what appears to be the plain meaning of the Liturgy; and to the Liturgy we make our appeal in its behalf.

VI.—In 1548, when the English "Order of the Communion" was published, and even while the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. was in preparation, Cranmer still strongly maintained the mediæval doctrine of the Sacrament; and many other divines were as yet unwilling to pronounce against it. Nor were they under the necessity of committing themselves on the subject, by either retaining prominently in the Church Service or rejecting from it the dogma of Transubstantiation: for that dogma was not plainly

* Hooker, E. P. v. 67; Ken's 'Eucharistica,' p. 40; Browne on the Thirty-nine Articles, Art. xxviii. § 2, vol. ii. p. 487. For a full discussion of both sides of the question, see the two works of Dr. Pusey on the Real Presence, and that of the late Dean Goode on the Eucharist.

asserted in the Sarum Missal. Two changes, however, were made in the first Liturgy of the Reformed Church, which, though slight, were not without their significance.

1. The nearest approach to an assertion of Transubstantiation in the Mass was in the prayer of Consecration, which contained these words, "which oblation we beseech Thee, O Almighty God, that thou wouldest vouchsafe in all respects to bleꝑss, appꝓove, ratꝓify, and make reasonable and acceptable, that it may become to us the body and the blood of thy most dearly beloved Son our Lord Jesus Christ." Even here the expression, "may become to us" (*nobis fiat*), was capable of an interpretation consistent with the notion of a real but spiritual presence. At any rate the framers of the Prayer-book were content to retain this passage with a slight modification, and in the Liturgy of 1549 it appeared thus, "Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech thee, and with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bleꝑss and sancꝓtify these Thy gifts, and creatures of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ." Here the "may become" (*fiat*) of the Missal is changed to "may be," perhaps as a concession to those who objected to the notion of a change of substance.

2. The second change was one not of words, but of ceremonial. The elevation and adoration of the consecrated elements became from the thirteenth century the almost universal practice of the Western Church, in recognition of the change of substance. The Missals generally contained a rubric after the prayer of Consecration, directing the priest (1) to incline to the Host, and with bowed head adore it; and (2) to elevate it above his forehead, that the people might adore it. In the English Church these directions were not adopted in the written ritual, nor followed, as it seems, in practice. The priest was to *incline* to the Host, but not to adore it; he was to elevate it, but only that it might be *seen* by the people; "Inclinet se sacerdos ad hostiam, et postea elevet eam supra frontem, ut possit a populo videri:"* It is true that the direction to the

* Maskell, 'Ancient Liturgy,' containing a reprint of the Sarum Missal, from the edition of 1492, published at Rouen, folio, believed to be the editio princeps. The words in the Roman Missal of 1759 are "Prolatis verbis consecrationis statim Hostiam consecratam genuflexus adorat." It is stated that

priest to incline *and adore* is to be found in a few very late editions of the Sarum Missal; *e.g.*, in that of 1519, which is the basis of the English translation recently published by the Church Press Company (London, 1868). But even if that edition, printed at Paris, can be relied on as representing the contemporaneous usage of the English Church, it shows that the adoration was limited to the celebrant, and was not required of the people.* In the Prayer-book of 1549, the rubric of the Missal to which reference has just been made was replaced by one which directed the words of consecration to be said "without any elevation or showing the Sacrament to the people;" so that if there had been any adoration, or even any reverential regard of the elements, short of worship, it was now suppressed. And though this rubric disappeared at the revision in 1552, we cannot suppose, with our knowledge of the principles which prevailed at that revision, that the omission was intended in the slightest degree to sanction the practice of elevation, especially as a rubric was added at the end of the Service repudiating the notion of adoration, and the 29th of the 42 Articles of Religion, agreed on in the same year, contained this sentence:—"The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not commanded by Christ's ordinance to be kept, carried about, lifted up, nor worshipped."

VII.—Scarcely, however, was Edward's first Prayer-book in circulation, when Cranmer gave up the doctrine of the corporal or localised presence, and following where Ridley had led the way three or four years before, publicly maintained the spiritual as opposed to the corporal presence, the spiritual reception by faith as distinguished from the carnal eating. Disputations on the subject, held before the nobility in the Parliament House itself and before the students in both Universities, tended to ripen the question rapidly in the public mind, and to give greater definite-

"The English manuals for the use of the laity disguise the adoration. A Dublin pocket Missal (1840, Tegg) gives it thus: 'kneeling, the priest adores, and then elevates the sacred host:' which leaves a convenient ambiguity about what is adored. In the edition for the laity (1850, Dolman) this rubric is entirely omitted, along with most other rubrics." 'The Bible, the Missal, and the Breviary,' by the Rev. G. Lewis (Edinburgh, 1853), p. 525.

* See Archdeacon Freeman, 'Principles of Divine Service,' vol. ii. part I. pp. 84-91; who, however, does not seem to have been aware of the rubric in the edition of 1519. Maskell, 'Ancient Liturgy,' p. 92. Procter, 'On the Book of Common Prayer,' p. 320.

ness to the views of the Reformers; and the more advanced tenets of the continental Protestants began to exercise more and more influence in England. A revision of the Liturgy was therefore demanded; and in 1552 the second Prayer-book of Edward VI. appeared, with some important doctrinal modifications in the Communion Service.

1. The passage in the prayer of Consecration, which had been altered in 1549 (as we have seen above), was in 1552 brought into its present form, "Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee, and grant that we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood." The term "Thy creatures," was not applied to the elements in the Canon of the Mass, which spoke of them before consecration as "these gifts, these presents, these holy immaculate sacrifices," "hæc dona, hæc munera, hæc sancta illibata sacrificia" (*i.e.*, these *our* gifts, &c.). The Consecration Prayer of 1549 prays God to "sanctify these *Thy* gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body," &c.; the word *creatures* being borrowed from the old Service-books, in which it is frequently used, *e.g.* in the office for making a catechumen, "exorcizo, te, creatura salis." In 1552, the important step is taken of declaring the elements to be, even at the moment of reception, "Thy creatures of bread and wine." Moreover, the partaking of Christ's body and blood, though dependent on the reception of the bread and wine, is treated as a separate reception, *i.e.* a spiritual one. And the introduction into this sentence of the words, "according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion," seems intended to suggest the thought which should be uppermost in the mind at the moment of reception, viz., not that the bread and wine are received as His body and blood, but that they are received "in remembrance," &c.; as He said, "Do this in remembrance of me."

In the former part of the sentence upon which we have just been commenting, as it stood in 1549, the Holy Spirit was invoked for the sanctification of the elements, "with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy

gifts, and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood," &c. There seems to have been no objection to this invocation (so customary in the ancient liturgies) on any doctrinal ground, except for its connexion with the clause in the latter part of the sentence implying the real presence in the consecrated elements, "that they may be unto us," &c.; and that connexion not only caused its omission in 1552, but probably also prevented its restoration at the last review. This point receives illustration from the manner in which the Office of Baptism was treated by the revisers of 1662. In the first Prayer-book of Edward VI., a short Service for the benediction of the water to be used at the font was appended to the Office of Baptism, as a substitute for the *Benedictio fontis* of the Sarum Manual. It contained these words, "Send down, we beseech Thee, the same Thy Holy Spirit, to assist us, and to be present at this our invocation of Thy holy name: Sanctify ✠ this fountain of baptism, Thou that art the Sanctifier of all things, that, by the power of Thy Word, all those that shall be baptised therein may be spiritually regenerated, and made the children of everlasting adoption." Here was an invocation of the Holy Spirit for the sanctification of the element of water, analogous to that contained in the Prayer of Consecration of the elements for the other Sacrament. In 1552 this Service was omitted, except that its short supplications, "O merciful God, grant," &c., were with some modification and abbreviation incorporated into the Baptismal Office, together with the collect, "Almighty, everlasting God," &c. This collect, however, did not include any petition for the sanctification of the water till the review in 1662, when the words "sanctify this water for the mystical washing away of sin" were introduced. The revisers, no doubt, had a reason for dealing in a different way with the two Sacraments, for restoring the invocation of the Holy Spirit, in a modified form, in the one case, and continuing the omission of it in the other; and the continued omission in the Holy Communion is rendered more significant by the restoration in Baptism. Whatever may have been their inclination, they probably thought it not advisable to run the risk of reopening the controversy on the Lord's Supper by restoring the whole or even a part of the sentence which had been omitted. If restored entire, it would have brought back a mode of expression which

was hardly consistent with the rest of the Service; "that they may be to us the body and blood," &c.; while the restoration would have appeared poor and incomplete, if the former part, the invocation of the Holy Spirit, had been introduced in a modified form, without any words implying the Presence in the consecrated bread and wine.

2. Another and a scarcely less important change was made in the same direction by the appointment of a new form for the administration of the elements. The form which was used before the Reformation at the delivery of the Host was not set down in the Missal; nor can we now ascertain what it was. Most probably, however, it was the same as that which was prescribed in the "Order of Communion of 1548" (followed by the Liturgy of 1549), with the addition of a form for the delivery of the cup, which was now restored to the laity, and with the addition of the clause "which was {given / shed} for thee." In 1552 this form was set aside, and the hortatory form was substituted, "Take and eat this," &c; "Drink this," &c.

This alteration was wisely modified in 1559, when the form of 1548-9 was restored and prefixed to that of 1552. But it is obvious that the ancient form does not actually assert anything as to the Real Presence, and is open to widely different interpretations. It may be understood to mean "The body of our Lord," &c., which is present in this bread, or "The body of our Lord," &c., of which this bread is the sign or sacrament; and each person may put upon it the meaning which he thinks the more consistent with the context, or with the general teaching of the Communion Service. The words, as used in the unreformed Church, would doubtless be taken to imply a local presence, and perhaps even a change of substance. As they stand in our Service, they must take their colour from their surroundings, among which the sentence immediately following, "Take and eat this in remembrance," &c., is one of the most significant. Moreover, the clause, "which was {given / shed} for thee," carries the mind of the communicant back to the sacrifice once made for him upon the cross, and was doubtless inserted in order to prevent his regarding the elements, which he is about to receive, as

the life-giving Body and Blood by which his own body and soul are to be preserved unto everlasting life.

3. Again, the Prayer-book of 1549 contained several passages, not one of which, we may observe, was derived from the Missal, which would appear intended to inculcate, not indeed the dogma of transubstantiation, but the presence of Christ's body and blood in the elements; and it is remarkable that every one of these passages was materially altered in 1552.

(*a*) Thus in the exhortation, "Dearly beloved in the Lord," &c., the last sentence but one ended in 1549 as follows:—". . . He hath left in those holy mysteries, as a pledge of his love, and a continual remembrance of the same, his own blessed body and precious blood, for us to feed upon spiritually to our endless comfort and consolation." This, in 1552, was altered to the present form, "He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries as pledges of his love, and [for a, 1662] continual remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort."

(*b*) The exhortation which stands second in order in the book of 1549, but first in our present book, had in 1549, near the beginning, this passage: "Wherefore our duty is to come to these holy mysteries, with most hearty thanks to be given to Almighty God for his infinite mercy and benefits given and bestowed upon us his unworthy servants, for whom He hath not only given his body to death, and shed his blood, but also doth vouchsafe *in a Sacrament and Mystery to give us his said body and blood* to feed upon spiritually. The which Sacrament being so divine and holy a thing," &c. This, in 1552, was altered in the following manner: "Our duty is to render to Almighty God our Heavenly Father most hearty thanks, for that He hath given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance, as it is declared unto us, as well by God's Word as by the holy Sacraments of His blessed body and blood; the which being so comfortable a thing," &c. In 1662 the sentence was recast in its present form: "Wherefore it is our duty to render most humble and hearty thanks to Almighty God our Heavenly Father, for that He hath given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that

holy Sacrament" (referring to "the most comfortable Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ" in the previous sentence). "Which being so divine and comfortable a thing," &c. This may perhaps fairly be claimed as suggestive of a real presence in the elements; but though it may be possible to see here the influence of a somewhat different doctrinal view from that which dictated the words used in 1552, we have not the explicit statement of 1549, that "He doth vouchsafe in a Sacrament and Mystery to give us His said body and blood."

(*c*) The prayer of humble access ("We do not presume," &c.) contained in 1549 the following sentence: "Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ and to drink His blood *in these holy mysteries*, that we may continually dwell in Him, and He in us, and that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood." In 1552 the words "in these holy mysteries" were expunged, and the sentence was arranged as we now have it. We cannot doubt that the omission of the words "in these holy mysteries" was made for the same purpose here as elsewhere. Still the former part of the sentence, "Grant us *so* to eat," &c., was allowed to remain. And the *so to eat* has been thought to imply that there is another way of eating which is not profitable, and thus to favour the notion that the unworthy as well as the faithful communicant eats the body and drinks the blood of Christ, or, in other words, that the body and blood of Christ are locally present in the elements, and are received by every one.

This view might seem to an ordinary reader to be expressly negatived by the Twenty-ninth Article, "Of the wicked which eat not the body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper," which says, "The wicked and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ; but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing." But the bearing of the Article on this point is sought to be avoided (1) by denying that the title "of the wicked which eat not," &c., is of any authority; (2) by asserting that the gist of the Article is in the word "partakers," and that to partake is to eat *profitably*, and that there-

fore a person may eat though he does not partake, a definition of the word "partake" which seems at variance with its use in the post-communion prayer, "that all we who are partakers of this holy communion may be fulfilled with Thy grace;" and (3) by neglecting the latter part of the Article, which says the wicked "do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing;" *i.e.* the sign, but not the thing signified. The revisers of 1552 cannot have intended the sentence in question to bear a meaning which would render nugatory the omission made by them in that same sentence; and a meaning may be given it which is perfectly consistent with that omission. We should understand the word "so" in this passage ("so to eat the body," &c.) as meaning "so effectually;" as it does in the Marriage Service, "so fill you with all spiritual benediction and grace;" and in the Commination Service, "so turn thine anger from us;" in neither of which places can it have been intended by the word "so" to imply that there was a way of doing the thing prayed for without producing the effect desired.*

(*d*) In the post-communion prayer, commencing "O Lord and Heavenly Father," occurs the "oblation of ourselves," containing these words, "humbly beseeching Thee that all we who are partakers of this holy communion may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction." This passage, together with the whole "oblation of ourselves," in 1549, preceded the Communion, and then stood as follows: "humbly beseeching thee that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion may *worthily receive* the most precious body and blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction;" where the words "may *worthily receive* the most precious body," &c., seem to imply the possibility of unworthy reception. We would not, however, lay great stress on the alteration made in this passage (though so far as it has weight it confirms what we have said on the prayer of humble access), because it may be accounted for by the transposition of the passage in 1552 to the post-communion, by which the omission of words referring to subsequent communion, such as "may worthily receive," &c., was rendered necessary.

* This point is well put in the 'Contemporary Review' for April, 1868, vol. vii. p. 631.

(*e*) But the alternative prayer of thanksgiving in the post-communion, "Almighty and everliving God," &c., furnishes another clear instance in which, by the omission of the words "in these holy mysteries," a sentence was modified in 1552 which in its original form might seem to imply the presence of Christ in the elements, and so to identify the reception of the Body and Blood with the reception of the bread and wine. In 1549 the prayer commenced thus: "Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou *hast* vouchsafed to feed us *in these holy mysteries* with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; and hast assured us, duly receiving the same, of thy favour and goodness towards us." In 1552 it was altered to the present form: "Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou *dost* vouchsafe to feed us, who *have duly received these holy mysteries*, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; and dost assure us thereby of Thy favour and goodness towards us." Here we observe, that not only was the clause "*in these holy mysteries*," changed into "who have duly received these holy mysteries," but the clause making due reception the condition of obtaining the benefits of the Sacrament is transposed, so as to apply not (as in 1549) to the reception of the Body and Blood, but to the reception of the bread and wine, the "holy mysteries," implying the possibility that they, not (as in 1549) that the Body and Blood, may be unduly received. That *duly* here means "worthily," *dignè*, not "regularly," *ritè*, is certain, especially when we consider its original position in the prayer of 1549.

4. It remains to say a few words upon the Declaration as to kneeling at the receiving of the Communion, the "black rubric" at the end of the Service.

This was appended by an order of the Royal Council in 1552, several months after the publication of the revised Prayer-book of that year. The practice of kneeling at the Communion having been objected to by the Puritans, as appearing to be an adoration of the elements, it was defended by Cranmer in a letter addressed to the Council, and dated Oct. 7, 1552, in which he said, "If the kneeling of the people should be discontinued for the time of the receiving of the Sacrament, so that at the receipt thereof they

should rise up and stand or sit, and then immediately kneel down again, it should rather import a contemptuous than a reverent receiving of the Sacrament." * Upon this the Declaration seems to have been added, to meet the objection of the Puritans. It was omitted in 1559, and not restored till the last review. In its restored form it bears trace of the change in doctrine which we have already noticed as distinguishing the review of 1662 from that of 1552. In 1552 it declared that "it is not meant thereby (*i. e.* by the kneeling) that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood." This would seem not only to exclude the notion of adoration, but also to be a denial of "any real and essential presence in the elements of Christ's natural flesh and blood." But, as altered in 1662, it declares that "no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood." It no longer therefore denies, though neither does it affirm, "any real and essential presence," but it seems still to deny any "*corporal presence* of Christ's natural flesh and blood," however that term may be defined: and it explains that the order for kneeling at Communion is simply "for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion as might otherwise ensue."

VIII.—We come now to the doctrine of the "Eucharistic Sacrifice," meaning by that term the oblation of the elements *after consecration*. It has unquestionably been held by many divines of great authority in our Church, with more or less distinctness, that the consecrated elements are offered up to God by the priest. Such an oblation appears to be recognised by Cranmer; and he calls it "gratificatory," as expressive of our gratitude and duty to God; in which sense undoubtedly we offer "our sacrifice of praise of thanksgiving" in the post-Communion. By others it is called a "commemorative" or "representative" sacrifice, because it is a "showing forth," a "memory," or memorial of

* Rev. T. W. Perry 'On the Declaration on Kneeling' (1863), p. 78.

the Lord's death, a remembrance (*ἀνάμνησις*) of it made not only before the communicants, but before God. It was thus spoken of by Bishop Overall, Bishop Andrews, and many others. By some (as by Johnson, in his 'Unbloody Sacrifice') it is called "propitiatory," in a sober qualified sense, not as having any intrinsic power to obtain remission of sins, but as an acceptable offering to God, like every offering of prayer and service.* There has of late been a tendency on the part of some of the "ritualistic" school to insist overmuch, and without taking proper care to explain themselves, upon this last view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; and if they have not actually fallen into error, they have incurred the danger of being misapprehended and suspected. Thus, a writer in the 'Tracts for the Day,' on the Real Presence, says (p. 273), "It is scarcely sufficient to say that the priest pleads before God the merits of the one sacrifice upon the cross, as we may be said to plead it when we say 'by thy cross and passion, by thy precious death and burial,' or, when we conclude our prayers, 'through Jesus Christ our Lord.' Neither the perpetual sacrifice in heaven, nor the Christian sacrifice on earth, can be adequately represented as an *acted prayer*. Both are to be regarded most mysteriously, but most truly, as a continuation of the One Sacrifice by the One Priest." A Catechism, edited by a Committee of Clergy, after explaining the Sacrifice in the Eucharist to be "the continual presentation of His own oblation of Himself once offered, *and a part of that same offering*," has this question: "In what way should we offer this sacrifice?" and the answer, "Thirdly, as a sin-offering, to obtain pardon for our offences."†

The use of the chasuble during the celebration of the Holy Communion is connected with this doctrine, and declared to be expressive of it; *e. g.* by the Rev. W. J. Bennett, in his evidence before the Ritual Commission, p. 72:—"Q. 2606. Is any doctrine involved in your using the chasuble?—A. I think there is. Q. What is that doctrine?—A. The doctrine of the Sacrifice. Q. Do you consider yourself a sacrificing priest?—A. Yes. Q. What authority have you in the Prayer-book for that?—A. That, again, would involve a long answer. It has been so interpreted

* See 'Tracts for the Times,' vol. iv. No. 81.
† See Charge of the Bishop of Llandaff for 1866, pp. 84, 116.

by our divines, the divines of our Church, from the Reformation downwards. Q. Then you think you offer a propitiatory sacrifice?—A. Yes, I think I do offer a propitiatory sacrifice."

It does not concern us now to inquire whether or not the statements contained in the above extracts are in conformity with the teaching of our Church: though to many of us it will appear an incontrovertible proposition that neither in her Prayer-book, her Catechism, her Articles, nor her Homilies, has our Church given any intimation that there is any sense whatever in which the Holy Communion may be expounded as a sacrifice of Christ.

But at any rate the use of the word "propitiatory" would seem to be objectionable, as implying an efficacy in the Sacrament independent of the one real sacrifice made on the cross. This, probably, is not meant even by those amongst us who hold the highest view of the Sacrament. Yet they cannot be entirely acquitted of blame, if they persist in the use of a term to which a meaning disclaimed by them is not unreasonably attached. We would fain hope that there is more real agreement on this subject among the different schools in our Church, than may appear to the superficial observer or to the zealous partisan, and that the questions which divide us are in a great measure logomachies: and we cannot but think that in this, as in other matters, great mischief has been done by adopting, as standards and tests of faith, expressions which have not the authority either of Scripture or of the Church.

IX.—But leaving this train of thought, which lies beyond the scope of the present essay, I shall proceed now to show that the idea of a sacrifice of the consecrated elements, like the doctrine of the objective Presence in the elements, though it had a place in the First Prayer-book of Edward VI., has been carefully excluded in all subsequent revisions. It will be seen that the history of the changes which the Liturgy has undergone since its first promulgation, adds materially to the doctrinal significance which it has in its present form. (1) In the Communion Office of 1549, as in the Canon of the Mass, the prayer of Consecration was followed immediately by the prayer of Oblation; and it will be seen, on comparison, that the oblation in the Reformed Liturgy was framed upon that in the Missal, of which the

following is a translation:—"Wherefore also, O Lord, we thy servants, together with thy holy people, calling to mind the most blessed passion of the same Christ thy Son our Lord God, together with his resurrection from the dead and his glorious ascension into heaven, offer to thy excellent Majesty of thy gifts and bounties, a pure, a holy, a spotless sacrifice, the holy bread of eternal life, and the cup of everlasting salvation. Upon which do thou vouchsafe to look with favourable and gracious countenance, and accept them, as thou didst accept the gifts of thy righteous servant Abel, the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and the holy sacrifice, the pure oblation, which thy high priest Melchisedeck offered to thee."* In the Liturgy of 1549 it was as follows:—"Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesu Christ, we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make, having in remembrance his blessed passion, mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension, rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same, entirely desiring thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," &c. In 1552, the first part of this sentence, in which oblation is made before God of His "holy gifts," the consecrated elements, was omitted, and the latter part, which speaks of what Cranmer called the "gratificatory" oblation, "this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," and the presentation of "ourselves, our souls and bodies," was removed to the post-Communion, where it has ever since remained, and where it cannot possibly be taken to have reference to any oblation of the elements.

In the prayer of Consecration care was taken, even in the first

---

* From the 'Sarum Missal in English,' 1868. We subjoin the original from Maskell's 'Ancient Liturgy,' p. 96:—"Unde et memores, Domine, nos servi tui, sed et plebs tua sancta, ejusdem Christi Filii tui Domini Dei nostri tam beatæ passionis, necnon et ab inferis resurrectionis, sed et in cœlos gloriosæ ascensionis, offerimus præclaræ majestati tuæ de tuis donis ac datis, hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam: panem sanctum vitæ æternæ, et calicem salutis perpetuæ.

Supra quæ propitio ac sereno vultu respicere digneris, et accepta habere, sicuti accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri tui justi Abel, et sacrificium patriarchæ nostri Abrahæ; et quod tibi obtulit summus sacerdos tuus Melchisedech, sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam."

Reformed Liturgy, to declare emphatically that the Saviour made upon the cross (by His one oblation once offered) "a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world," in order, as it would seem, to exclude the Romish dogma of the repetition of a propitiatory offering in the sacrifice of the Mass, against which the 31st Article is also directed. It may, however, still be truly said that in this prayer we commemorate and plead before God the "one sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction" made upon the cross; and whether this commemoration of the sacrifice may be properly regarded as a "continuation of the sacrifice," or as a "commemorative sacrifice," or as (in a qualified sense) "a propitiatory sacrifice," is perhaps no more than a question about words, and at any rate is a question into which, for our present purpose, it is unnecessary for us to enter.

2. The prayer for the Church Militant is, in part, a substitute for the commemoration and commendation of the faithful departed, which in the Missal followed the prayer of Consecration. In the Liturgy of 1549 it was placed immediately *before* the prayer of Consecration. It began with the petition, "We humbly beseech thee most mercifully to receive these our prayers, which we offer," &c., and contained no mention of alms or oblations; and a rubric directing that the bread and wine should be set upon the altar was placed after the offertory, and was followed by "The Lord be with you," &c., "Lift up your hearts," &c., and the *Sanctus*, with its preface. In 1552 the prayer was transferred to its present place after the offertory, and the rubric just spoken of was omitted. The prayer was connected with the offertory by the words "*to accept our almose*, and to receive these our prayers," &c. At the last review a rubric was prefixed to the prayer, directing the priest to place upon the table the bread and wine; and in the prayer, after "to accept our alms," the words "and oblations" were added. Though a reasonable inference, it is by no means a necessary one, that the "oblations" here spoken of are the bread and wine just placed on the table; and there are not a few who contend that this term comprehends, if it does not exclusively refer to, the "other devotions of the people" (rubric after the offertory), especially as the latter phrase was introduced at the same time as the words "and oblations" in the prayer, at

the last review. Thus the Bishop of St. David's says,* "In the Anglican Liturgy there is indeed an offertory and an oblation of common things for sacred and charitable uses;" and Dr. Cardwell † considers that the oblations, as well as the alms, refer to offerings made in money. This opinion certainly receives some support from the fact which he notices, that Sancroft, at the revision in 1662, proposed to alter the rubric thus: "The priest shall then *offer up* and place upon the table so much bread and wine," &c. But the words "offer up" were not adopted. "Had it been otherwise," says Dr. Cardwell, "a different interpretation might have been suggested for the word 'oblations.'"

But assuming that an oblation is here unquestionably contemplated of the unconsecrated elements, this is obviously a very different thing from the oblation of the body and blood of Christ, present in the consecrated Host; it does not constitute a "propitiatory," or even a "commemorative" sacrifice; nor does it in any way countenance or lead up to the notion of such a sacrifice; and it is justified on ritualistic grounds of another kind, supplied by the practice of the Jewish Church. Thus we are told by an eminent writer on Ritual, that in making the presentation of the gifts which she has provided, and their consecration, to be two distinct actions, the Church follows the pattern of the Mosaic system, "in which the set and solemn delivering up and slaying of the victim at the door of the tabernacle court, by the bringer of it, constituted, for his part, the offering; the consecration and consumption of it being left to the priest, and to the heaven-descended fire of the altar." ‡

We have yet to notice one or two points, which, though of minor importance, are not without their weight, when combined with what has been already adduced, as indications of the mind of the framers and revisers of the Liturgy with reference to the Eucharistic sacrifice.

3. The word "altar," implying a sacrifice, was exclusively used in the Missal, and was retained in the Liturgy of 1549,

* Charge for 1866, p. 94.

† Cardwell 'On Conferences,' p. 382. See also as to the use of the word "oblations" Hooker, v. 79; Robertson, 'How shall we conform to the Liturgy?' p. 208.

‡ Archdeacon Freeman, 'Principles of Divine Service,' vol. ii. part ii. p. 341.

together with the words "table" and "God's board," which last is a mediæval term, and is found in an old English 'Exhortation before Communion,' of probably the thirteenth or fourteenth century.* The three terms appear not to have been used without discrimination by our Reformers in 1549. When the Lord's table was spoken of, with reference solely to the ministrations of the Priest, it was called "the altar," in token of its sacrificial aspect. Thus at the beginning of the Communion Office the priest was directed to "stand humbly afore the midst of the altar;" after the offertory the priest was to "set the bread and wine upon the altar;" at the prayer for the Church Militant, the priest was to "turn him to the altar;" after the prayer of Consecration there was this rubric,—"These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the altar." But when it was regarded with reference to the communicants, and to their participation of the sacred feast, the word "table" was used, and the minister was not called the "Priest," a word which might denote his relation to God, but "Curate," a word expressive of his relation to his people. Thus in the rubrics at the commencement of the Office, the "Curate" was directed "to advertise evil doers in any wise not to presume to the *Lord's table*, until," &c.; the "Curate" was not to suffer those betwixt whom he perceived that there reigned malice and hatred, to be *partakers of the Lord's table*, until, &c. The "Curate" (altered in 1552 to the "Priest") was to address to those who were minded to receive the Sacrament the Exhortation, "Dearly beloved in the Lord, ye that mind," &c., in the course of which blasphemers, &c., were warned "not to come to that holy *table*." But (3) where the priest joins himself with others, and speaks in their names, there the words "altar" and "table" seem to have been thought not so convenient, and the old English term "God's board" † was adopted. Thus the rubric before the "*Gloria in Excelsis*," which then followed immediately after the Introit, directed that "the priest, standing at God's board, shall begin, 'Glory be to God on high;'" and before the prayer of Humble Access, "Then shall the priest, turning him to God's board, kneel down, and say in the name of all them," &c. The word "table" was adopted

* See Maskell, 'Mon. Rit.,' iii. 349.

† In Wyclif's New Testament "board" was commonly used as the translation of *mensa*: in Tyndale's (1534) "table" was everywhere substituted.

everywhere, except in the last rubric, in 1552; and here also in 1662. There can be no doubt that the word "altar" was dropped for the purpose (1) "of disabusing the minds of the people of the gross and superstitious notions with reference to the Eucharistic sacrifice (amounting to a belief in an actual reiteration of the sacrifice of the Cross), which had gradually grown up during the latter centuries of the mediæval period, and (2) of bringing back into its due prominence the truth (which the denial of the cup, and the usual exclusive Communion of the celebrant, had most grievously obscured) that this holy ordinance is intended to be a means of heavenly communion with Christ by the spiritual feeding on his most precious body and blood."*

4. Another point which is not without its significance is the omission of the word "Mass" from the title of the Communion Office. In 1549 the Service was entitled "The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass." In 1552 the present title was substituted, "The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion." Although there is nothing in the word "Mass," if its etymology be considered, which could suggest the notion of sacrifice, yet it was associated in the minds of the Reformers with the pre-Reformation Service, and especially with its sacrificial aspect, as we may infer from the 30th Article of 1552, which, like our 31st Article, spoke of the "sacrifices of the Masses" (Missarum sacrificia), "in the which it was commonly said that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead." The change made in the title in 1552 was in conformity with the changes made at the same time in the Office itself, by which the idea of communion became predominant, and the idea of sacrifice was entirely excluded.

5. The position of the priest standing in the front of the Communion table, and facing towards the East, is strongly insisted on by Ritualists, as appropriate to the sacrificial character of the Office. And certainly the Liturgy of 1549, which retained the oblation of the elements, was very express in directing that this position should be observed. The rubric at the commencement enjoined that "the priest standing humbly afore the midst of the altar" should "say the Lord's Prayer with this collect."

* Blunt's 'Annotated Prayer-book,' p. 164.

The prayer "for the whole state of Christ's Church" was preceded by a rubric directing the priest to "turn him to the altar, and say or sing distinctly," &c. This prayer was immediately followed by the prayer of Consecration, at the end of which it was directed that "these words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the altar." Afterwards came the prayer of humble access, with a direction to the priest that in saying it he was to "turn him to God's board."

It is a remarkable and significant fact that in the Prayer-book of 1552, which omitted the oblation of the consecrated elements, every one of these directions was altered. The rubric at the commencement was changed to its present form, "And the priest standing at the North side of the table shall say," &c. The rubric prefixed to the prayer "for the whole state of Christ's Church," &c., was simply that which we now have, "After which the priest shall say." The rubric before the prayer of humble access was altered from "turning him to God's board," to "kneeling down at God's board" (now "kneeling down at the Lord's table"). The prayer of Consecration, having been separated from the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church, &c., and placed immediately after the prayer of humble access, during which the priest was directed to kneel, was now preceded by a rubric simply directing him to "*stand up*, and say as followeth." Thus every rubric ordering the priest to turn to the Lord's table was omitted; and the only assignable motive for the omission appears to have been the wish to remove what was regarded as a token of sacrifice.

At the last review in 1662 several rubrical directions were added, regulating the position and posture of the priest. The rubric at the beginning of the Service was left untouched, but the priest was ordered to "turn to the people" in rehearsing the Commandments, and then to "stand as before" in saying the prayer for the King; and having turned to the people for the Absolution, &c., "to turn to the Lord's table," and say "It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty," &c. The rubric before the prayer of Consecration was expanded, "When the priest, standing before the table, hath so ordered the bread and wine . . . he shall say," where the words "standing before the table," in their grammatical connexion, apply only to the clause

following, "hath so ordered," &c., and do not override the rest of the sentence.

6. If, then, these rubrical additions of 1662 can be regarded as any evidence of a reaction towards the sacrificial view of the Eucharist, they are at the utmost very halting, timid, and ambiguous indications of such a reaction. The prefatory rubric of 1552, "The priest standing at the North side of the table," still remains the governing direction for the whole Office, and has accordingly been made the subject of a protracted controversy.* On the one hand it is maintained that the priest is to stand *at*, i. e. *close to*, the North *side*, i. e. the North *end* of the table. This interpretation was actually introduced into the rubric of the Scotch Liturgy, published under the sanction of Laud and Wren in 1637, "The presbyter standing at the north side or end of the table;" and it is remarkable that in this matter of the position of the celebrant the Scotch Liturgy separated itself further than the English from the First Prayer-book of Edward VI., to which in some important points, *e. g.* the invocation of the Holy Spirit, the form of administration of the elements, and the prayer of Oblation after the prayer of Consecration, it very nearly approximated. The rubric before the last-named prayer omitted the direction "when the priest standing before the table," &c., and instead of it contained the somewhat peculiar order that the presbyter "during the time of consecration shall stand at such a part of the holy table, where he may with the more ease and decency use both his hands." This was afterwards explained and justified by Laud on the ground that "the North end of the table is in most places too narrow and wants room to lay the Service-books open before him that officiates, and to place the bread and wine within his reach." † Here the position of the celebrant even in the act of consecration is represented by Archbishop Laud as a matter not at all of doctrinal significance, but of mere convenience, and the North end is indicated as the usual position. And that the "North side" was in practice generally understood at that time to mean

* See especially Dr. Littledale on 'The North Side of the Altar' (1865), and for the other side of the question an article in the 'Contemporary Review,' vol. iii. p. 356.

† See Laud's Works, iv. 495. Blunt's 'Annotated Prayer-book,' p. 583.

the North end, is sufficiently shown by the well-known case of the impeachment of Bishop Wren in 1641, for standing at the West side of the table, with his face to the East, and his back to the people; his defence being, not that it was right to stand in that position, but that he did so *during the Prayer of Consecration*, because of his lowness of stature. The same interpretation was followed by the Nonjurors; and it has continued to regulate the practice of the great majority of clergymen to the present day. On the other hand it is said, the priest is instructed by this rubric to stand *at*, i. e. facing *towards*, the North side, which term is here used, in a non-natural but well-understood liturgical sense, to mean that part of the West side of the altar which is nearest the north, corresponding to *dextrum cornu altaris* in the Missal. In other words, the priest is to stand facing East, at a point between the middle of the West side and the North end. For this latter interpretation there appears to be absolutely no good evidence or authority; while against the commonly received one no valid objection has been adduced.

7. No argument in support of the sacrificial aspect of the Communion Office can be drawn from the use of the word "priest," for that word was retained at the revision in 1552, as the title of the officiating minister, not only in this Service, but in several places in the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, and in the Office of Baptism, in neither of which Offices certainly could the notion of sacrifice have any place. On the other hand, the substitution of "presbyter" for "priest," in the Scotch Liturgy of 1637, is rather to be regarded as a concession to Scotch feeling than as a testimony against the Eucharistic sacrifice.*

X.—After what has now been said, it will be apparent that the effect of the changes made in the Communion Office since 1549 has been almost entirely to suppress the doctrines of the local or objective Presence, and of the Eucharistic sacrifice, leaving those doctrines to be found by those who seek them in a few expressions which are of doubtful and disputed interpretation. The suppression may be lamented, may be attributed to vacillation on the part of Cranmer and those who acted with him

* Collier, 'History,' vol. viii. p. 115 (ed. 1841).

on followed after him. But the fact remains, and speaks for itself. At the same time it must in fairness be acknowledged, that there is not anything in the Liturgy which amounts to a negation or a prohibition of the doctrines in question. The words in which the Holy Sacrament was originally instituted are open, as we know, to a diversity of interpretations; and we may be thankful that our Service also contains phrases of ambiguous meaning, in which these disputed doctrines are believed to have found a refuge, like the prophets in the caves of the earth. Certainly we are not compelled to adopt the view of a recent Roman Catholic writer, who, after enlarging, in no friendly spirit, on the "Zuinglian" aspect of our Prayer-book, winds up his dissertation with the sweeping conclusion, that they who receive and use our Liturgy, "*deny* the Holy Sacrifice of the Eucharist, *deny* the priesthood of the Church, *deny* the real presence of our Lord in the Eucharist, *profess* and *assert* that the Eucharistic sacrifice is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."* No such denials or assertions are made in any part of the Service. There is quite as good reason for saying that they who receive and use the Missal, deny the dogma of Transubstantiation, which, as we have seen, is not asserted in the Canon of the Mass. Indeed, the prayer of Oblation, used in the Mass *after* consecration, still speaks of the elements as "thine own gifts and bounties," which would seem inconsistent with the notion that they are become the body and blood of Christ.

Nor, considering what has been said above as to the form of administering the elements and the prayer of Humble Access (pp. 274-276), shall we concur entirely in the conclusion at which the late Dean of Ripon arrives after his review of the Communion Office: "Thus all the passages in the Prayer-book of 1549, which might be taken to imply that the presence of the body and blood of Christ was to be looked for in or as annexed and bound by consecration to the consecrated bread and wine, or that the faithless receive the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper as well as the faithful, have been altered in all the subsequent revisions, so as no longer to countenance that

* The Rev. Mr. Estcourt on 'The Dogmatic Teaching of the Book of Common Prayer on the subject of the Holy Eucharist,' p. 57.

view. And no passage can be found in our present Prayer-book which intimates more than the presence of Christ in the *rite* to the faithful, and the *spiritual* eating and drinking of his body and blood in the act of communion by the faithful."* We have seen that there still remain two passages at least, which are understood by some to imply the objective Presence in the elements, though they are readily susceptible of a different interpretation.

Surely that was a happy spirit of toleration and comprehension, which presided over the revision of the Prayer-book at the commencement of the reign of Elizabeth. The concessions which were made in 1559 by the extreme Reformers, though they were not followed by all the healing consequences that were hoped from them, undoubtedly conciliated many who had been aggrieved by the trenchant changes of 1552. From that time our Church has always retained in her communion two parties or schools of thought, the one attaching more importance to the objective element of religion, the other valuing almost exclusively the subjective element; both, however, claiming to have the same purpose in view—the worship of God in spirit and in truth. It has been said now by the one, and now by the other of these two parties, that the attempt to be comprehensive has produced more loss than gain; and that the Liturgy has, as a consequence, been "sicklied o'er" with the pale hues of compromise. At the present day it is urged that the ceremonial of the Church has been shorn of its ancient beauty and its expressive symbolism, that her dogmatic teaching as to the Sacrament has been obscured, and is not always logically consistent with itself. We may listen with real respect to those who take such a regretful retrospect, but we shall not join in their lamentations. Very few would now think it desirable, and still fewer would think it possible, to contract the ample limits within which the belief of individual members of the Church may range, or to restrain the "liberty of prophesying" hitherto enjoyed by the clergy. The tendency of the independent earnest thought, the thirst for truth, with which every great subject, not excepting the greatest of all, religion itself, is now examined, may be to promote divergence rather than

* Dean Goode on 'The Eucharist,' p. 619.

agreement upon many deep questions. Distress and perplexity may thus be occasioned to some of us, and discomfort to all; but still more serious evils would probably result from the endeavour to enforce uniformity of teaching, an object which, in the present state of things, whatever standard of uniformity we might adopt, could only be attained by silencing some of the most thoughtful and devoted of the clergy, and alienating a portion of the more intelligent among the laity. May we not be allowed to think that a not infallible Church has done well, if, on a subject so mysterious and so much debated as the Holy Communion, she has abstained from defining her doctrine with sharp and logical precision? May we not be thankful that persons holding widely different views on the subject may, so far as our formularies are concerned, kneel together, without any sacrifice of their convictions, at the table of their common Lord? And, with these feelings, must we not protest against the attempt which is now being made by the revival of obsolete ornaments and ceremonies to emphasise one view of the Sacrament to the exclusion of the other; must we not declare it to be a breach of the Concordat which has been tried and proved for three centuries, and on the whole has been found favourable to the peace and stability of the Church?

W. G. HUMPHRY.

I have thought it might be useful, for the purpose of reference, to append the Offices for the administration of the Holy Communion, as set forth severally in the years 1549, 1552, 1559, and 1662, in parallel columns.—EDITOR.

LITURGIES AS PUT FORTH BY AUTHORITY IN 1549, 1552, 1559, 1662.

1549.	1552.
The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass.	The order for the administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion.
¶ So many as intend to be partakers of the Holy Communion shall signify their names to the Curate over night, or else in the morning afore the beginning of Matins, or immediately after.	The same. Morning Prayer or immediately after.
¶ And if any of these be an open and notorious evil liver, so that the congregation by him is offended, or have done any wrong to his neighbours by word or deed; the Curate shall call him and advertise him in any wise not to presume to the Lord's Table, until he have openly declared himself to have truly repented and amended his former naughty life, that the congregation may thereby be satisfied, which afore were offended; and that he have recompensed the parties whom he hath done wrong unto, or at the least be in full purpose so to do, as soon as he conveniently may.	The same. The Curate having knowledge thereof, &c. declare himself to be in full purpose, &c.
¶ The same order shall the Curate use with those betwixt whom he perceiveth malice and hatred to reign; not suffering them to be partakers of the Lord's Table, until he know them to be reconciled. And if one of the parties so at variance be content to forgive from the bottom of his heart all that the other hath trespassed against him, and to make amends for that he himself hath offended: and the other party will not be persuaded to a godly unity, but remain still in his frowardness and malice: the Minister in that case ought to admit the penitent person to the Holy Communion, and not him that is obstinate.	The same.
¶ Upon the day and at the time appointed for the ministration of the Holy Communion, the Priest that shall execute the holy ministry shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that min-	

1559.	1662.
The same.	The order of the administration, &c.
So many as do intend, &c.	So many as intend to be partakers of the Holy Communion shall signify their names to the Curate, at least some time the day before.
The same.	
The same.	¶ And if any of those be an open and notorious evil liver, or have done any wrong to his neighbours by word or deed, so that the congregation be
The same.	thereby offended; the Curate, having knowledge thereof, shall call him and advertise him, that in any wise he presume not to come to the Lord's Table, until he hath openly declared himself to have truly repented and amended his former naughty life, that the congregation may thereby be satisfied, which before were offended; and that he hath
The same.	recompensed the parties to whom he hath done wrong; or at least declare himself to be in full purpose so to do, as soon as he conveniently may.
The same.	The same.
	Provided that every Minister so repelling any, as is specified in this or the next precedent paragraph of this Rubrick, shall be obliged to give an account of the same to the Ordinary within fourteen days after, at the farthest. And the Ordinary shall proceed against the offending person according to the Canon.

1549.

istration: that is to say, a white albe plain, with a vestment or cope. And when there be many priests or deacons, then so many shall be ready to help the Priest in the ministration as shall be requisite; and shall have upon them likewise the vestures appointed for their ministry, that is, to say, albes with tunicles. Then shall the clerks sing in English, for the office, or introit (as they call it), a Psalm appointed for that day.

The Priest, standing humbly afore the midst of the altar, shall say the Lord's Prayer with this Collect.

Almighty God unto whom all hearts be open, and all desires known, &c.

Then shall he say a Psalm appointed for the introit, which Psalm ended, the Priest shall say, or else the clerks shall sing:

iii. Lord have mercy upon us.
iii. Lord have mercy upon us.
iii. Lord have mercy upon us.

Then the Priest, standing at God's board, shall begin: Glory be to God on high.

The clerks. And in earth peace, good-will towards men.

We praise thee, we bless thee, we worship thee, we glorify thee, we give thanks to thee for thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty.

O Lord, the only-begotten Son Jesu Christ; O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou that takest away the sins of the world, receive our prayer.

Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy upon us; for thou only art holy, thou only art the Lord. Thou only (O Christ), with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the glory of God the Father. Amen.

Then the Priest shall turn him to the people and say:

1552.

¶ The table, having at the Communion-time a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel, where Morning Prayer and Evening Prayer be appointed to be said.

And the Priest, standing at the north side of the table, shall say the Lord's Prayer with this Collect following.

Almighty God unto whom all hearts be open, all desires known, &c.

1559.	1662.
The same.	The table, at the Communion-time, having, &c.
The same.	And the Priest, standing at the north side of the Table, shall say the Lord's Prayer with the Collect following, the people kneeling.
The same.	The same.

1549.

The Lord be with you.
The answer. And with thy spirit.
The Priest. Let us pray.

Then shall follow the Collect of the day, with one of these two Collects following, for the King.

Almighty God, whose kingdom is everlasting and power infinite, have mercy upon the whole congregation; and so rule the heart of thy chosen servant, Edward the Sixth, our king and governor, that he (knowing whose minister he is) may above all things seek thy honour and glory; and that we, his subjects, &c.

Almighty and everlasting God, we be taught, &c.

The Collects ended, the Priest, or he that is appointed, shall read the Epistle in a place assigned for the purpose, saying:

The Epistle of Saint Paul, written in the —— chapter of ——, to the ——.

The Minister then shall read the Epistle. Immediately after the Epistle ended, the Priest, or one appointed to read the Gospel, shall say:

The holy Gospel, written in the —— chapter of ——.

1552.

¶ Then shall the Priest rehearse distinctly all the Ten Commandments; and the people kneeling shall, after every Commandment, ask God's mercy for their transgression of the same, after this sort:

Minister. God spake these words and said, I am the Lord thy God: thou shalt have none other god but me.
People. Lord have mercy upon us and incline our hearts to keep this law.
Minister. Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of anything that is in heaven above or in the earth beneath, nor in the waters under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, and visit the sin of the fathers, &c.,—to the end of the Ten Commandments.

The same.

; the Priest standing up and saying:
Priest. Let us pray.

The same.

The same.

¶ Immediately after the Collects, the Priest shall read the Epistle, beginning thus:

¶ The Epistle, written in the —— chapter of ——.

And the Epistle ended, he shall say the Gospel, beginning thus:

The Gospel, written in the —— chapter of ——.

1559.	1662.
The same.	Then shall the Priest, turning to the people, rehearse distinctly all the Ten Commandments, and the people still kneeling shall, after every Commandment, ask God's mercy for their transgression thereof for the time past, and grace to keep the same for the time to come, as followeth:
The same.	The same.
Thou shalt not now bow down, &c.,—to the end of the Ten Commandments, except that Sabbath is written 'Sabboth,' and murder, 'murther.'	or in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down to them nor worship them, for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, and visit the sins of the fathers, &c.
The same.	Then shall follow one of these two Collects for the King, the Priest standing as before, and saying:
for the Queen; the Priest, &c.	Let us pray.
¶ Let us pray. *Priest.*	
The same.	The same.
	have mercy upon the whole Church, &c.
	that we and all his subjects, &c.;
	Or,
The same.	Almighty and everlasting God, we are taught, &c.
The same.	¶ Then shall be said the Collect of the Day. And immediately after the Collect the Priest shall read the Epistle, saying, The Epistle [or, The portion of Scripture appointed for the Epistle] is written in the —— chapter of ——, beginning at the —— verse. And the Epistle ended, he shall say, Here endeth the Epistle. Then shall he read the Gospel (the people all standing up), saying, The holy Gospel is written in the —— chapter of ——, beginning at the —— verse. And the Gospel ended, shall be sung or said the Creed following, the people still standing, as before.
The same.	
The same.	
The same.	

1549.	1552.
The clerks and people shall answer: Glory be to thee, O Lord.	
The Priest or Deacon then shall read the Gospel. After the Gospel ended, the Priest shall begin:	And the Epistle and Gospel being ended, shall be said the Creed.
I believe in one God (The clerks shall sing the rest) the Father Almighty, &c.	I believe, &c.
After the Creed ended, shall follow the Sermon or Homily, or some portion of one of the Homilies, as they shall be hereafter divided; wherein if the people be not exhorted to the worthy receiving of the holy sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, then shall the Curate give this Exhortation to those that be minded to receive the same:	
Dearly beloved in the Lord, ye that mind to come to the Holy Communion of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, must consider what St. Paul writeth to the Corinthians, how he exhorteth all persons diligently to try and examine themselves, before they presume to eat of that bread and drink of that cup. For as the benefit is great, if with a truly penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy sacrament (for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood; then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we be made one with Christ, and Christ with us): so is the danger great if we receive the same unworthily. For then we become guilty of the body and blood of Christ our Saviour; we eat and drink our own damnation, not considering the Lord's body; we kindle God's wrath over us; we provoke him to plague us with divers diseases, and sundry kinds of death. Therefore if any here be a blasphemer, advouterer, or be in malice or envy, or in any other grievous crime (except he be truly sorry therefore, and earnestly minded to leave the same vices, and do trust himself to be reconciled to Almighty God, and in charity with all the world), let him bewail his sins, and not come to that holy table, lest after the taking of that most blessed bread the devil enter into him as he did into Judas, to fill him full of all iniquity and bring him to destruction both of body and soul. Judge therefore yourselves (brethren) that ye be not judged of the Lord. Let your mind be without desire to sin; repent	*The alterations in the exhortation following are transferred here from page 316 for the better comparison of the exhortations.* The same. we be one with Christ, &c. we be guilty, &c. against us, &c. a blasphemer of God, an hinderer or slanderer of his word, an adulterer, or be in malice or envy, or in any other grievous crime, bewail your sins, and come not to this holy table, lest after the taking of that holy sacrament the devil enter into you, as he entered into Judas, and fill you full of all iniquities, and bring you to destruction both of body and soul. Judge therefore yourselves (brethren) that ye be not judged of the Lord; repent you truly for your sins past; have a lively and stedfast faith in Christ our Saviour; amend your lives, and be in perfect charity with all men, &c.

1559.	1662.
The same.	
The alterations in the exhortation following are transferred here from page 317 for the better comparison of the exhortations:	*The alterations in the exhortation following are transferred here from page 317 for the better comparison of the exhortations.*
The same.	The same.
	how Saint Paul exhorteth all persons, &c.
	with a true penitent heart, &c.
The same.	we are one with Christ, &c.
The same.	we are guilty, &c.
The same.	The same.
The same.	kinds of death. Judge therefore yourselves, brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord, &c.
	The same.

1549.

you truly for your sins past; have an earnest and lively faith in Christ our Saviour; be in perfect charity with all men; so shall ye be meet partakers of those holy mysteries. And above all things ye must give most humble and hearty thanks to God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for the redemption of the world by the death and passion of our Saviour Christ, both God and Man; who did humble himself, even to the death upon the cross, for us miserable sinners; which lay in darkness and shadow of death, that he might make us the children of God, and exalt us to everlasting life. And to the end that we should alway remember the exceeding love of our Master, and only Saviour, Jesu Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which (by his precious bloodshedding) he hath obtained to us; he hath left in those holy mysteries, as a pledge of his love, and a continual remembrance of the same, his own blessed body and precious blood, for us to feed upon spiritually, to our endless comfort and consolation. To him therefore, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, let us give (as we are most bounden) continual thanks; submitting ourselves wholly to his holy will and pleasure, and studying to serve him in true holiness and righteousness all the days of our life. Amen.

¶ In cathedral churches or other places, where there is daily communion, it shall be sufficient to read this Exhortation above written once in a month. And in parish churches, upon the week days, it may be left unsaid.

And if upon the Sunday or holyday the people be negligent to come to the Communion, then shall the Priest earnestly exhort his parishioners to dispose themselves to the receiving of the holy communion more diligently, saying these or like words unto them:

Dear friends, and you especially upon whose souls I have cure and charge, on —— next I do intend, by God's grace, to offer to all such as shall be godly disposed the most comfortable sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, to be taken of them in the remembrance of his most fruitful and glorious passion: by the which passion we have obtained remission of our sins, and be made partakers of the kingdom of heaven;

1552.

exceeding great love, &c.

(which by his precious bloodshedding) he hath obtained to us; he hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of his love, and continual remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort, &c.

1559.	1662.
	who lay in darkness and the shadow of death.
The same.	The same.
	only Saviour Jesus Christ thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which
The same.	by his precious bloodshedding, &c.
	The same.
	and for a continual, &c.

1549.

whereof we be assured and ascertained, if we come to the said sacrament with hearty repentance for our offences, stedfast faith in God's mercy, and earnest mind to obey God's will, and to offend no more. Wherefore our duty is to come to these holy mysteries with most hearty thanks to be given to Almighty God for his infinite mercy and benefits given and bestowed upon us his unworthy servants, for whom he hath not only given his body to death, and shed his blood, but also doth vouchsafe, in a sacrament and mystery, to give us his said body and blood, to feed upon spiritually. The which sacrament being so divine and holy a thing, and so comfortable to them that receive it worthily, and so dangerous to them that will presume to take the same unworthily; my duty is to exhort you, in the mean season, to consider the greatness of the thing, and to search and examine your own consciences, and that not lightly, nor after the manner of dissimulers with God, but as they which should come to a most godly and heavenly banquet; not to come but in the marriage garment required of God in scripture; that you may (so much as lieth in you) be found worthy to come to such a table. The ways and means thereto is, first, that you be truly repentant of your former evil life; and that you confess with an unfeigned heart to Almighty God your sins and unkindness towards his Majesty, committed either by will, word, or deed, infirmity, or ignorance: and that with inward sorrow and tears you bewail your offences, and require of Almighty God mercy and pardon, promising to him (from the bottom of your hearts) the amendment of your former life. And amongst all others, I am commanded of God especially to move and exhort you to reconcile yourselves to your neighbours, whom you have offended, or who hath offended you, putting out of your hearts all hatred and malice against them, and to be in love and charity with all the world, and to forgive others as you would that God should forgive you. And if any man have done wrong to any other, let him make satisfaction and due restitution of all lands and goods wrongfully taken away or withholden, before he come to God's board; or at the least be in full mind and purpose so to do, as soon as

1552.

The exhortation following is transferred here from page 316 *for the better comparison of it with the others.*

Dearly beloved, forasmuch as our duty is to render to Almighty God our heavenly Father most hearty thanks for that he hath given his Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance, as it is declared unto us as well by God's word as by the holy sacraments of his blessed body and blood; the which being so comfortable a thing to them which receive it worthily, and so dangerous to them that will presume to receive it unworthily, my duty is to exhort you to consider the dignity of the holy mystery and the great peril of the unworthy receiving thereof, and so to search and examine your own consciences as you should come holy and clean to a most godly and heavenly feast; so that in no wise you come but in the marriage garment required of God in holy scripture; and so come and be received as worthy partakers of such a heavenly table. The way and means thereto is: first, to examine your lives and conversation by the rule of God's commandments; and whereinsoever ye shall perceive yourselves to have offended either by will, word, or deed, there bewail your own sinful lives, confess yourselves to Almighty God, with full purpose of amendment of life. And if ye shall perceive your offences to be such, as be not only against God, but also against your neighbours; then ye shall reconcile yourselves unto them, ready to make restitution and satisfaction according to the uttermost of your powers for all injuries and wrongs done by you to any other; and likewise being ready to forgive other that have offended you, as you would have forgiveness of your offences at God's hand: for otherwise the receiving of the holy Communion doth nothing else but increase your damnation. And because it is requisite that no man should come to the holy Communion but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore if there be any of you which by the means aforesaid cannot quiet his own conscience, but requireth further comfort or counsel; then let him come to me or some other discreet and learned minister

1559.

The exhortation following is transferred here from page 317, for the better comparison of it with the others.

The same.

1662.

The exhortation following is transferred here from page 313, for the better comparison of it with the others.

Dearly beloved, on —— day next I purpose, through God's assistance, to administer to all such as shall be religiously and devoutly disposed the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, to be by them received in remembrance of his meritorious Cross and Passion; whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the Kingdom of heaven. Wherefore it is our duty to render most humble and hearty thanks to Almighty God our heavenly Father, for that he hath given his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament. Which being so divine and comfortable a thing to them who receive it worthily, and so dangerous to them that will presume to receive it unworthily; my duty is to exhort you in the mean season to consider the dignity of that holy mystery, and the great peril of the unworthy receiving thereof; and so to search and examine your own consciences (and that not lightly, and after the manner of dissemblers with God; but so) that ye may come holy and clean to such a heavenly Feast, in the marriage garment required by God in holy Scripture, and be received as worthy partakers of that holy Table.

The way and means thereto is; First, to examine your lives and conversations by the rule of God's commandments; and whereinsoever ye shall perceive yourselves to have offended, either by will, word, or deed, there to bewail your own sinfulness, and to confess yourselves to Almighty God, with full purpose of amendment of life. And if ye shall perceive your offences to be such as are not only against God, but also against your neighbours; then ye shall reconcile yourselves unto them; being ready to make restitution and satisfaction according to the uttermost of your powers, for all injuries and wrongs done by you to any other; and being likewise ready to forgive others that have offended you, as ye would have forgiveness of your offences at God's hand: for otherwise the receiving of the holy Communion

1549.

he is able; or else let him not come to this holy table, thinking to deceive God, who seeth all men's hearts. For neither the absolution of the priest can anything avail them, nor the receiving of this holy sacrament doth anything but increase their damnation. And if there be any of you whose conscience is troubled and grieved in anything, lacking comfort or counsel, let him come to me or to some other discreet and learned priest taught in the law of God, and confess and open his sin and grief secretly, that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice, and comfort, that his conscience may be relieved; and that of us (as of the Ministers of God and of the Church) he may receive comfort and absolution, to the satisfaction of his mind, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness; requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession not to be offended with them that do use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the priest; nor those also which think needful or convenient, for the quietness of their own consciences, particularly to open their sins to the priest, to be offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to God, and the general confession to the Church; but in all things to follow and keep the rule of charity; and every man to be satisfied with his own conscience, not judging other men's minds or consciences; whereas he hath no warrant of God's Word to the same.

¶ Then shall follow for the offertory one or more of these sentences of holy scripture, to be sung whiles the people do offer; or else one of them to be said by the minister, immediately afore the offering.

1552.

of God's word, and open his grief, that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice, and comfort, as his conscience may be relieved; and that by the ministry of God's word he may receive comfort and the benefit of absolution to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness.

After the Creed, if there be no Sermon, shall follow one of the Homilies already set forth, or hereafter to be set forth, by common authority.

After such Sermon, Homily, or Exhortation, the Curate shall declare unto the people, whether there be any holydays or fasting days the week following; and earnestly exhort them to remember the poor, saying one or more of these sentences following, as he thinketh most convenient by his discretion.

1559.

The same.

1662.

doth nothing else but increase your damnation. Therefore if any of you be a blasphemer of God, an hinderer or slanderer of his Word, an adulterer, or be in malice, or envy, or in any other grievous crime, repent you of your sins, or else come not to that holy Table; lest, after the taking of that holy Sacrament, the devil enter into you, as he entered into Judas, and fill you full of all iniquities, and bring you to destruction both of body and soul.

And because it is requisite, that no man should come to the holy Communion, but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore if there be any of you who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned Minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness.

The same.

¶ Then the Curate shall declare unto the people what Holydays, or Fasting-days, are in the week following to be observed. And then also (if occasion be) shall notice be given of the Communion; and Briefs, Citations, and Excommunications read. And nothing shall be proclaimed or published in the Church, during the time of Divine Service, but by the Minister; nor by him anything but what is prescribed in the Rules of this Book, or enjoined by the Queen, or by the Ordinary of the place.

¶ Then shall follow the Sermon, or one of the Homilies already set forth, or hereafter to be set forth, by authority.

¶ Then shall the Priest return to the Lord's Table, and begin the Offertory, saying one or more of these Sentences

1549.

Let your light, &c.

Where there be Clerks they shall sing one or many of the sentences above written, according to the length and shortness of the time that the people be offering.

In the mean time, whiles the Clerks do sing the offertory, so many as are disposed shall offer to the poor men's box, every one according to his ability and charitable mind. And at the offering-days appointed, every man and woman shall pay to the Curate the due and accustomed offerings.

Then so many as shall be partakers of the holy communion shall tarry still in the quire, or in some convenient place nigh the quire, the men on the one side and the women on the other side. All other (that mind not to receive the said holy communion) shall depart out of the quire, except the Minister and Clerks.

Then shall the Minister take so much bread and wine as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the holy communion, laying the bread upon the corporas, or else in the paten, or in some other comely thing prepared for that purpose; and putting the wine into the chalice, or else in some fair or convenient cup prepared for that use (if the chalice will not serve), putting thereto a little pure and clean water, and setting both the bread and wine upon the altar. Then the Priest shall say:

The Lord be with you.

Answer. And with thy spirit.

Priest. Lift up your hearts.

Answer. We lift them up unto the Lord.

Priest. Let us give thanks to our Lord God.

Answer. It is meet and right so to do.

The Priest. It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty that we should at all times and in all places give thanks to thee, O Lord, holy Father, almighty everlasting God.

1552.

The same—with the exception of a few verbal alterations.

¶ Then shall the Churchwardens, or some other by them appointed, gather the devotion of the people, and put the same into the poor men's box, and upon

1559.	1662.
	following, as he thinketh most convenient in his discretion.
The same—with the exception of a few verbal alterations.	The same—with the exception of a few verbal alterations.
The same.	¶ Whilst these sentences are in reading, the Deacons, Churchwardens, or other fit person appointed for that purpose, shall receive the Alms for the Poor,

1549.

The following is inserted here instead of at page 320, *in order that it may more easily be compared with the other versions of the prayer.*

Almighty and ever-living God, which by thy holy apostle hast taught us to make prayers and supplications, and to give thanks for all men; we humbly beseech thee most mercifully to receive these our prayers, which we offer unto thy divine Majesty, beseeching thee to inspire continually the universal church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord; and grant that all they that do confess thy holy name may agree in the truth of thy holy word, and live in unity and godly love. Specially we beseech thee to save and defend thy servant Edward, our king; that under him we may be godly and quietly governed; and grant unto his whole council and to all that be put in authority under him, &c.

The same.

grace; that with meek hearts, &c.

The same.

And especially we commend unto thy merciful goodness this congregation, which is here assembled in thy name,

1552.

the offering days appointed every man and woman shall pay to the Curate the due and accustomed offerings; after which done the Priest shall say:

Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth.

Almighty and everliving God, which by thy holy apostle hast taught us to make prayers and supplications, and to give thanks for all men; we humbly beseech thee most mercifully to accept our[c] alms, and to receive these our prayers, which we offer unto thy divine Majesty, beseeching thee to inspire continually the universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord; and grant that all they that do confess thy holy name may agree in the truth of thy holy word, and live in unity and godly love. We beseech thee also to save and defend all Christian kings, princes, and governors; and especially thy servant Edward, our king; that under him we may be godly and quietly governed; and grant unto his whole council and to all that be put in authority under him, that they may truly and indifferently minister justice to the punishment of wickedness and vice, and to the maintenance of God's true religion and virtue. Give grace (O heavenly Father) to all bishops, pastors, and curates, that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth thy true and lively word, and rightly and duly administer thy holy sacraments; and to all thy people give thy heavenly grace; and especially to this congregation here present, that with meek heart and due reverence they may hear and receive thy holy word; truly serving thee in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life. And we most humbly beseech thee of thy goodness (O Lord) to comfort and succour all them which in this transitory life be in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity. Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate. Amen.

[c] If there be none alms given unto the poor, then shall the words of accepting our alms be left out unsaid.

1559.

The same.

we humbly beseech thee most mercifully to accept our [c] almose and to receive, &c.

[c] If, &c.

Elizabeth our Queen; that under her

her

her

The same.

1662.

and other devotions of the people; in a decent bason to be provided by the Parish for that purpose; and reverently bring it to the Priest, who shall humbly present and place it upon the holy Table.

¶ And when there is a Communion, the Priest shall then place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient. After which done, the Priest shall say:

Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth.

Almighty and everliving God, who by thy holy apostle hast taught us to make prayers and supplications, and to give thanks, for all men; we humbly beseech thee most mercifully [to accept our alms and oblations, and] to receive these our prayers, which we offer unto thy Divine Majesty; beseeching thee to inspire continually the universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord; and grant that all they that do confess thy holy name may agree in the truth of thy holy word, and live in unity and godly love. We beseech thee also to save and defend all Christian kings, princes, and governours; and especially thy servant CHARLES, our King; that under him we may be godly and quietly governed. And grant unto his whole council, and to all that are put in authority under him, that they may truly and indifferently minister justice, to the punishment of wickedness and vice, and to the maintenance of thy true religion and virtue. Give grace, O heavenly Father, to all bishops and curates, that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth thy true and lively word, and rightly and duly administer thy holy sacraments. And to all thy people give thy heavenly grace; and especially to this congregation here present; that, with meek heart and due reverence, they may hear and receive thy holy word; truly serving thee in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life. And we most humbly beseech thee of thy goodness, O Lord, to comfort and succour all them who in this transitory life are in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity. And we also bless thy holy name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear; beseech-

If there be no alms or oblations, then shall the words [of accepting our alms and oblations] be left out unsaid.

1549.

to celebrate the commemoration of the most glorious death of thy Son. And here we do give unto thee most high praise, and hearty thanks, for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all thy saints from the beginning of the world; and chiefly in the glorious and most blessed Virgin Mary, mother of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord and God; and in the holy patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, whose examples (O Lord) and stedfastness in thy faith, and keeping thy holy commandments, grant us to follow. We commend unto thy mercy (O Lord) all other thy servants, which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace; grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy and everlasting peace; and that at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of thy Son, may altogether be set on his right hand, and hear that his most joyful voice, Come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world. Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate.

Continued as on page 320, which see.

1552.

Then shall follow this exhortation at certain times, when the Curate shall see the people negligent to come to the holy communion:

We be come together at this time, dearly beloved brethren, to feed at the Lord's supper; unto the which, in God's behalf, I bid you all that be here present, and beseech you for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, that ye will not refuse to come thereto, being so lovingly called and bidden of God himself. Ye know how grievous and unkind a thing it is, when a man hath prepared a rich feast, decked his table with all kind of provision, so that there lacketh nothing but the guests to sit down; and yet they

1559.

1662.

ing thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom. Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate. Amen.

¶ When the Minister giveth warning for the celebration of the holy Communion (which he shall always do upon the Sunday, or some Holyday, immediately preceding), after the Sermon or Homily ended, he shall read this Exhortation following:

See page 305, where this has been inserted.

The same.

¶ Or, in case he shall see the people negligent to come to the holy Communion, instead of the former, he shall use this Exhortation:

Dearly beloved brethren, on —— I intend, by God's grace, to celebrate the Lord's Supper: unto which, in God's behalf, I bid you all that are here present; and beseech you, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, that ye will not refuse to come thereto, being so lovingly called and bidden by God himself. Ye know how grievous and unkind a thing it is, when a man hath prepared a rich feast, decked his table with all kind of provision, so that there lacketh nothing but the guests to sit down; and yet they

1549. 1552.

which be called, without any cause, most unthankfully refuse to come: which of you in such a case would not be moved? Who would not think a great injury and wrong done unto him? Wherefore, most dearly beloved in Christ, take ye good heed lest ye, withdrawing yourselves from this holy supper, provoke God's indignation against you. It is an easy matter for a man to say, I will not communicate because I am otherwise letted with worldly business; but such excuses be not so easily accepted and allowed before God. If any man say, I am a grievous sinner, and therefore am afraid to come; wherefore then do you not repent and amend? When God calleth you, be you not ashamed to say you will not come? When you should return to God, will you excuse yourself, and say that you be not ready? Consider earnestly with yourselves how little such feigned excuses shall avail before God. They that refused the feast in the Gospel, because they had bought a farm, or would try their yokes of oxen, or because they were married, were not so excused, but counted unworthy of the heavenly feast. I for my part am here present, and, according unto mine office, I bid you in the name of God, I call you in Christ's behalf, I exhort you as you love your own salvation that ye will be partakers of this holy communion. And as the Son of God did vouchsafe to yield up his soul by death upon the cross for your health, even so it is your duty to receive the communion together in the remembrance of his death, as he himself commanded. Now if you will in no wise thus do, consider with yourselves how great injury you do unto God, and how sore punishment hangeth over your heads for the same. And whereas ye offend God so sore in refusing this holy banquet, I admonish, exhort, and beseech you that unto this unkindness ye will not add any more; which thing ye shall do, if ye stand by as gazers and lookers on them that do communicate, and be no partakers of the same yourselves. For what thing can this be accounted else than a further contempt and unkindness unto God. Truly it is a great unthankfulness to say nay, when ye be called; but the fault is much greater when men stand by, and yet will neither eat nor drink this holy communion with other. I pray you

1559.

The same.

1662.

who are called (without any cause) most unthankfully refuse to come. Which of you in such a case would not be moved? Who would not think a great injury and wrong done unto him? Wherefore, most dearly beloved in Christ, take ye good heed, lest ye, withdrawing yourselves from this holy Supper, provoke God's indignation against you. It is an easy matter for a man to say, I will not communicate, because I am otherwise hindered with worldly business. But such excuses are not so easily accepted and allowed before God. If any man say, I am a grievous sinner, and therefore am afraid to come: wherefore then do ye not repent and amend? When God calleth you, are ye not ashamed to say ye will not come? When ye should return to God, will ye excuse yourselves, and say ye are not ready? Consider earnestly with yourselves how little such feigned excuses will avail before God. They that refused the feast in the Gospel, because they had bought a farm, or would try their yokes of oxen, or because they were married, were not so excused, but counted unworthy of the heavenly feast. I, for my part, shall be ready; and, according to mine office, I bid you in the name of God, I call you in Christ's behalf, I exhort you as ye love your own salvation, that ye will be partakers of this holy Communion. And as the Son of God did vouchsafe to yield up his soul by death upon the Cross for your salvation: so it is your duty to receive the Communion in remembrance of the sacrifice of his death, as he himself hath commanded; which if ye shall neglect to do, consider with yourselves how great injury ye do unto God, and how sore punishment hangeth over your heads for the same, when ye wilfully abstain from the Lord's Table, and separate from your brethren, who come to feed on the banquet of that most heavenly food. These things if ye earnestly consider, ye will by God's grace return to a better mind: for the obtaining whereof we shall not cease to make our humble petitions unto Almighty God our heavenly Father.

1549.

1552.

what can this be else but even to have the mysteries of Christ in derision? It is said unto all, Take ye and eat: take, and drink ye all of this: do this in remembrance of me. With what face then, or with what countenance, shall ye hear these words? What will this be else but a neglecting, a despising and mocking of the Testament of Christ? Wherefore, rather than you should do so, depart you hence, and give place to them that be godly disposed. But when you depart, I beseech you ponder with yourselves from whom you depart. Ye depart from the Lord's table, ye depart from your brethren, and from the banquet of most heavenly food. These things, if ye earnestly consider, ye shall by God's grace return to a better mind: for the obtaining whereof we shall make our humble petitions, while we shall receive the holy Communion.

¶ And sometime shall be said this also, at the discretion of the Curate:
For the exhortation, see page 304.

Then shall the Priest say this Exhortation:

For the exhortation, see page 300.

The same exhortation as in 1552, *but inserted in the office as on page* 324.

¶ Then shall the Priest say to them that come to receive the holy communion:

You that do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and be in love and charity with your neighbours, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in his holy ways: draw near, and take this holy sacrament to your comfort; make your humble confession to Almighty God, before this congregation here gathered together in his holy name, meekly kneeling upon your knees.

¶ Then shall this general confession be made, in the name of all those that are minded to receive the holy communion, either by one of them, or else by one of the Ministers, or by the Priest himself, all kneeling humbly upon their knees:

1559.

The same.

For the exhortation, see page 305.

The same.

For the exhortation, see page 301.

The same.

The same.

1662.

¶ At the time of the celebration of the Communion, the Communicants being placed for the receiving of the holy Sacrament, the Priest shall say this Exhortation :

For the exhortation, see page 301.

¶ Then shall the Priest say to them that come to receive the holy Communion :

Ye that do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbours, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in his holy ways: Draw near with faith, and take this holy Sacrament to your comfort, and make your humble confession to Almighty God, meekly kneeling upon your knees.

¶ Then shall this general confession be made, in the name of all those that are minded to receive the holy Communion, by one of the Ministers; both he and all the people kneeling humbly upon their knees, and saying :

1549.	1552.
The same confession, but inserted in the office as on page 326.	*Confession as in the present Prayer-book.*
	Then shall the Priest or the Bishop (being present) stand up, and, turning himself to the people, say thus :
The same absolution, but inserted in the office as on page 326.	*The Absolution, as in the present Prayer-book.*
The same sentences, but inserted as on page 326.	Then shall the Priest also say : Hear what comfortable words, &c. *Sentences from Scripture as now.*
	¶ After the which the Priest shall proceed, saying : Lift up your hearts. *Answer.* We lift them up unto the Lord. *Priest.* Let us give thanks unto our Lord God. *Answer.* It is meet and right so to do.
	Priest. It is very meet, right, &c. (*as now*).
¶ Here shall follow the proper preface, according to the time, if there be any specially appointed; or else immediately shall follow : Therefore with angels, &c. (*as now*).	The same.
Proper Prefaces.	Proper Prefaces.
¶ Upon Christmas-day.	Upon Christmas-day and seven days after :
Because thou didst give Jesus Christ, thine only Son, to be born as this day for us; &c. (*as now*).	The same.
¶ Upon Easter-day.	Upon Easter-day and seven days after :
Preface, the same as now.	The same.
¶ Upon the Ascension-day.	Upon the Ascension-day and seven days after :
Through thy most dear beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord; who after his most glorious resurrection manifestly appeared to all his disciples, &c. (*as now*).	Through thy most dear beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord; who after his most glorious resurrection manifestly appeared to all his Apostles, &c. (*as now*).
¶ Upon Whit Sunday. Through Jesus Christ our Lord; ac-	Upon Whit Sunday and six days after : The same.

1559.	1662.
The same.	The same.
The same.	¶ Then shall the Priest (or the Bishop, being present) stand up, and, turning himself to the people, pronounce this Absolution :
The same.	The same.
The same.	Then shall the Priest say : The same.
The same.	¶ After which the Priest shall proceed, saying : Lift up your hearts. *Answer.* We lift them up unto the Lord. *Priest.* Let us give thanks unto our Lord God. *Answer.* It is meet and right so to do. ¶ Then shall the Priest turn to the Lord's Table, and say : It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, holy Father, Almighty, everlasting God. (These words [Holy Father] must be omitted on Trinity-Sunday.)
The same.	The same.
Proper Prefaces.	**Proper Prefaces.**
The same.	The same.
The same.	Because thou didst give Jesus Christ, thine only Son, to be born as at this time, &c.
The same.	The same.
The same.	The same.
The same.	Upon Ascension-day, and seven days after :
The same.	Through thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord, &c.
	The same.
The same.	The same.
The same.	Through Jesus Christ our Lord ; ac-

1549.

cording to whose most true promise the Holy Ghost came down this day, &c. (*as now*).

¶ Upon the Feast of the Trinity.

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times and in all places give thanks to thee O Lord, almighty, everlasting God, which art one God, one Lord; not one only Person, but three persons in one substance. For that which we believe of the glory of the Father, the same we believe of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, without any difference or inequality. Whom the angels, &c.

After which preface shall follow immediately:

Therefore with angels and archangels, and with all the holy company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious name; evermore praising thee, and saying:

¶ Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory. Hosannah in the highest. Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. Glory to thee, O Lord, in the highest.

This the Clerks shall also sing.

¶ When the Clerks have done singing, then shall the Priest or Deacon turn him to the people and say:

Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church.

¶ Then the Priest, turning him to the altar, shall say or sing, plainly and distinctly, this prayer following:

Almighty and everliving God, &c., *as on pages* 310-312.

O God, heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesu Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who made there (by his one oblation once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to

1552.

Upon the Feast of Trinity only:

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times and in all places give thanks to thee, O Lord almighty and everlasting God, &c.

without any difference or inequality. Therefore with, &c.

The same.

Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name; evermore praising thee, and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory. Glory be to thee, O Lord most high. Amen.

The following is transferred here from page 326 *for the purpose of comparison.*

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and did institute and in his holy

1559.	1662.
	cording to whose most true promise, the Holy Ghost came down as at this time, &c.
The same.	The same.
The same.	
	who art one God, &c.
	The same.
The same.	The same.
The same.	After each of which prefaces shall immediately be sung or said:
The same.	The same.

The following is transferred here from page 327, for the purpose of comparison.

The same.

The following is transferred here from page 327, for the purpose of comparison.

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel

1549.

celebrate a perpetual memory of that his precious death, *until* his coming again: hear us (O merciful Father) we beseech thee; and with thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bl✠ess and sanc✠tify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, who in the same night that he was [c] betrayed took bread; and when he had blessed and given thanks he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat; this is my body which is given for you: do this in remembrance of me.

[c] Here the Priest must take the bread into his hands:

Likewise after supper he [d] took the cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins. Do this as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

[d] Here the Priest shall take the cup into his hands.

These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the altar, without any elevation or showing the sacrament to the people:

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesu Christ, we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy divine majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make; having in remembrance his blessed passion, mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same; entirely desiring thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee (O Lord) ourself, our souls and bodies, to be a

1552.

Gospel command us to co[illegible] a perpetual memory of that his precious death until his coming again: hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech thee; and grant that we, receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine according to thy Son our Saviour Jesu Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood; who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you: do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper he took the cup: and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for remission of sins; do this as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

Transferred here from page 330, *for the purpose of comparison.*

O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls,

1559.

command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again; Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood: who, in the same night that he was betrayed, [a] took bread, and, when he had given thanks, [b] he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, [c] this is my body which is given for you: do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper, he [d] took the cup; and, when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this [e] is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me. Amen.

1662.

[a] Here the Priest is to take the paten into his hands:

[b] And here to break the bread:

[c] And here to lay his hand upon all the bread.

[d] Here he is to take the cup into his hand:

[e] And here to lay his hand upon every vessel (be it chalice or flagon) in which there is any wine to be consecrated.

Transferred here from page 331, for the purpose of comparison.

The same.

Transferred here from page 331, for the purpose of comparison.

The same.

1549.

reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee; humbly beseeching thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of thy Son Jesus Christ, and be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with thy Son Jesu Christ, that he may dwell in them and they in him. And although we be unworthy (through our manifold sins) to offer unto thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, and command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of thy holy angels, to be brought up into thy holy tabernacle, before the sight of thy divine Majesty; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Christ our Lord, by whom and with whom, in the Unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.

Let us pray:

As our Saviour Christ hath commanded and taught us, we are bold to say, Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation.

The answer. But deliver us from evil. Amen.

Then shall the Priest say, The peace of the Lord be alway with you.

The Clerks. And with thy spirit.

The Priest. Christ our paschal Lamb is offered up for us, once for all, when he bare our sins on his body upon the cross; for he is the very Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world; wherefore let us keep a joyful and holy feast with the Lord.

Here the Priest shall turn him toward them that come to the Holy Communion, and shall say:

You that, &c., *as on page* 316.

Then shall this general confession be made, in the name of all those that are minded to receive the Holy Communion, either by one of them, or else by one of

1552.

and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee; humbly beseeching thee, that all we which be partakers of this holy Communion may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction. And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.

1559.	1662.
	who are, &c.

1549.

the ministers, or by the Priest himself, all kneeling humbly upon their knees:

Confession as in the present Prayer-book.

Then shall the Priest stand up, and turning himself to the people, say thus:

The Absolution, as in the present Prayer-book.

Then shall the Priest also say:

Hear what comfortable words, &c.

Sentences from Scripture as now.

Then shall the Priest, turning him to God's board, kneel down and say in the name of all them that shall receive the Communion this prayer following:

We do not presume to come to this thy table (O merciful Lord) trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We be not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy table; but thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy. Grant us therefore (gracious Lord) so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood in these holy mysteries, that we may continually dwell in him and he in us, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood. Amen.

¶ Then shall the Priest first receive the Communion in both kinds himself, and next deliver it to other Ministers, if any be there present (that they may be ready to help the chief Minister), and after to the people.

¶ And when he delivereth the sacrament of the body of Christ, he shall say to every one these words:

The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.

1552.

Then shall the Priest, kneeling down at God's board, say in the name of all them that shall receive the Communion this prayer following:

The same.

to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him and he in us. Amen.

Then the Priest, standing up, shall say as followeth:

Almighty God &c., *as on page* 320.

¶ Then shall the Minister first receive the Communion in both kinds himself, and next deliver it to other Ministers, if any be there present (that they may help the chief Minister), and after to the people, in their hands, kneeling.

And when he delivereth the bread, he shall say:

Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart, by faith, with thanksgiving.

1559.	1662.
The same.	¶ Then shall the Priest, kneeling down at the Lord's Table, say in the name of all them that shall receive the Communion this prayer following:
We do not presume to this thy table, &c., the same.	We do not presume to come to this thy Table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy Table. But thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy; grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us. Amen.
so much as to gather the crumbs, &c.	
The same.	
The same.	¶ When the Priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the bread and wine that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands, he shall say the Prayer of Consecration, as followeth:
Almighty God, &c., *as on page* 321.	Almighty God, &c., *as on page* 321.
The same.	¶ Then shall the Minister first receive the Communion in both kinds himself, and then proceed to deliver the same to the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, in like manner (if any be present), and after that to the people also in order, into their hands, all meekly kneeling. And; when he delivereth the bread to any one, he shall say:
The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul into everlasting life: and take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thine heart, by faith, with thanksgiving.	The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.

1549.

And the Minister delivering the sacrament of the blood, and giving every one to drink once, and no more, shall say:

The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.

1552.

¶ And the Minister that delivereth the cup shall say:

Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

If there be a Deacon or other Priest, then shall he follow with the chalice; and as the Priest ministereth the sacrament of the body, so shall he (for more expedition) minister the sacrament of the blood in form before written.

In the Communion-time, the Clerks shall sing;

ii. O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world:

Have mercy upon us.

O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world:

Grant us thy peace.

Beginning so soon as the Priest doth receive the holy Communion, and when the Communion is ended, then shall the clerks sing the post-communion.

¶ Sentences of holy Scripture to be said or sung, every day one, after the holy Communion, called the post-communion;

Matt. xvi. 24; xxiv. 13.

Luke i. 68. Therefore let us serve him all the days of our life in holiness and righteousness accepted before him.

Luke xii. 43, 47.

John iv. 23; v. 14. Sin no more, &c. viii. 31, 32; xii. 36; xiv. 21, 23; xv. 7, 8.

Rom. viii. 31. If God, &c. 32, 33, 34, part of. xiii. 12.

1559.

And the Minister that delivereth the cup, shall say:

The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul into everlasting life; and drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

1662.

¶ And the Minister that delivereth the cup to any one shall say:

The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

¶ If the consecrated bread or wine be all spent before all have communicated, the Priest is to consecrate more according to the form before prescribed; beginning at [Our Saviour Christ in the same night, &c.] for the blessing of the bread: and at [Likewise after supper, &c.] for the blessing of the cup.

¶ When all have communicated, the Minister shall return to the Lord's Table, and reverently place upon it what remaineth of the consecrated elements, covering the same with a fair linen cloth.

1549.

1 Cor. i. 30, 31; iii. 16, 17, part of; iii. 20.
Eph. v. 1, 2.

Then the Priest shall give thanks to God in the name of all them that have communicated; turning him first to the people, and saying;

The Lord be with you.
The answer. And with thy spirit.
The Priest. Let us pray.

Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee for that thou hast vouchsafed to feed us in these holy mysteries with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; and hast assured us (duly receiving the same) of thy favour and goodness towards us; and that we be very members incorporate in thy mystical body, which is the blessed company of all faithful people, and heirs through hope of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of the most precious death and passion of thy dear Son. We therefore most humbly beseech thee, O heavenly Father, so to assist us with thy grace that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as thou hast prepared for us to walk in; through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with thee and the Holy Ghost be all honour and glory, world without end.

Then the Priest, turning him to the people, shall let them depart with this blessing:

The peace of God, &c.
Then the people shall answer, Amen.
Where there are no Clerks, then the Priest shall say all things appointed here for them to sing.

1552.

Then shall the Priest say the Lord's Prayer, the people repeating after him every petition.

¶ After which shall be said as followeth:
O Lord and heavenly Father, *as on page* 322.

Or this.

The same.
thou dost vouchsafe to feed us which have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; and dost assure us thereby of thy favour, &c.

be also heirs

We now most humbly

¶ Then shall be said or sung
Glory be to God, &c.

Then the Priest or the Bishop, if he be present, shall let them depart with this blessing:

The same.

1559.	1662.
The same.	The same.
The same.	The same.
O Lord and heavenly Father, *as on page* 323.	O Lord and heavenly Father, *as on page* 323.
The same.	The same.
The same throughout.	Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; and dost assure us thereby of thy favour and goodness towards us; and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people; and are also heirs through hope of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of the most precious death and passion of thy dear Son. And we most humbly beseech thee, O heavenly Father, so to assist us with thy grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as thou hast prepared for us to walk in; through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom, with thee and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.
The same.	The same.
The same.	The same.
The same.	The same.

1549.	1552.
When the holy Communion is celebrated on the week-day, or in private houses, then may be omitted the Gloria in excelsis, the Creed, the homily, and the exhortation beginning Dearly beloved, &c.	
¶ Collects to be said after the Offertory, when there is no Communion, every such day one:	Collects to be said after the Offertory, when there is no Communion, every such day one; and the same may be said also, as often as occasion shall serve, after the Collects of either Morning or Evening Prayer, Communion, or Litany, by the discretion of the Minister:
Assist us mercifully, &c. through Christ our Lord.	The same. The same.
O Almighty Lord and everliving God, &c.	The same.
Grant, we beseech thee, &c.	The same.
Prevent us, &c.	The same.
Almighty God, &c. Jesu Christ our Lord.	The same. The same.
Almighty God which, &c.	The same.
¶ For rain: O God, heavenly Father, &c. (*as now in our Prayer-book, with a few verbal alterations*).	
For fair weather: O Lord God, &c. (*as now in our Prayer-book, with a few verbal alterations*).	
Upon Wednesdays and Fridays, the English Litany shall be said or sung in all places after such form as is appointed by the King's Majesty's injunctions; or as is or shall be otherwise appointed by his Highness. And, though there be none to communicate with the Priest, yet these days (after the Litany ended) the Priest shall put upon him a plain albe or surplice, with a cope, and say all things at the altar (appointed to be said at the celebration of the Lord's Supper) until after the Offertory; and then shall add one or two of the Collects afore-written as occasion shall serve, by his discretion. And then, turning him to the people, shall let them depart with the accustomed blessing.	Upon the holydays, if there be no Communion, shall be said all that is appointed at the Communion, until the end of the Homily, concluding with the general prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth; and one or more of these Collects before rehearsed, as occasion shall serve.
And the same order shall be used	

1559.		1662.
The same.		Collects to be said after the Offertory, when there is no Communion, every such day one or more; and, &c.
The same.		The same.
The same.		through Jesus Christ our Lord.
The same.		O Almighty Lord and everlasting God, &c.
The same.		The same.
The same.		The same.
The same.	Jesus Christ our Lord.	The same. The same.
The same.		Almighty God who, &c.
The same.		¶ Upon the Sundays and other holy-days (if there be no Communion) shall be said all that is appointed at the Communion, until the end of the general Prayer [For the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth], together with one or more of these Collects last before rehearsed, concluding with the Blessing.

1549.

all other days, whensoever the people be customably assembled to pray in the church, and none disposed to communicate with the Priest.

Likewise in chapels annexed, and all other places, there shall be no celebration of the Lord's Supper except there be some to communicate with the Priest. And in such chapels annexed, when the people hath not been accustomed to pay any holy bread, then they must either make some charitable provision for the bearing of the charges of the Communion, or else (for receiving of the same) resort to their parish church. For avoiding of all matters and occasion of dissension, it is meet that the bread prepared for the communion be made throughout all this realm after one sort and fashion; that is to say unleavened and round, as it was afore, but without all manner of print, and something more larger and thicker than it was, so that it may be aptly divided into divers pieces; and every one shall be divided into two pieces at the least or more, by the discretion of the Minister, and so distributed. And men must not think less to be received in part than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

And forasmuch as the Pastors and Curates within this realm shall continually find, at their costs and charges in their cures, sufficient bread and wine for the holy Communion (as oft as their parishioners shall be disposed for their spiritual comfort to receive the same), it is therefore ordered, that in recompense of such costs and charges the parishioners of every parish shall offer every Sunday, at the time of the Offertory, the just value and price of the holy loaf (with all such money and other things as were wont to be offered with the same) to the use of their Pastors and Curates, and that in such order and course as they were wont to find and pay the said holy loaf.

Also that the receiving of the sacrament of the blessed body and blood of Christ may be most agreeable to the institution thereof, and to the usage of the primitive Church; in all cathedral and collegiate churches there shall always some communicate with the Priest that ministereth. And that the same may also be observed everywhere abroad

1552.

And there shall be no celebration of the Lord's Supper, except there be a good number to communicate with the Priest, according to his discretion.

¶ And if there be not above twenty persons in the parish of discretion to receive the Communion, yet there shall be no Communion except four or three at the least communicate with the Priest. And in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches where be many Priests and Deacons, they shall all receive the Communion with the Minister every Sunday at the least, except they have a reasonable cause to the contrary.

¶ And to take away the superstition which any person hath or might have in the bread and wine, it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten at the table with other meats, but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten. And if any of the bread or wine remain, the Curate shall have it to his own use.

The bread and wine for the Communion shall be provided by the Curate and the Churchwardens, at the charges of the parish; and the parish shall be discharged of such sums of money, or other duties, which hitherto they have paid for the same, by order of their houses every Sunday.

1559.

The same.

1662.

¶ And there shall be no celebration of the Lord's Supper, except there be a convenient number to communicate with the Priest, according to his discretion.

¶ And if there be not above twenty persons in the parish of discretion to receive the Communion; yet there shall be no Communion, except four (or three at the least) communicate with the Priest.

¶ And in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches and Colleges, where there are many Priests and Deacons, they shall all receive the Communion with the Priest every Sunday at the least, except they have a reasonable cause to the contrary.

¶ And to take away all occasion of dissension and superstition, which any person hath or might have concerning the bread and wine, it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten; but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten.

¶ And if any of the bread and wine remain unconsecrated, the Curate shall have it to his own use; but if any remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the Church, but the Priest, and such other of the Communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same.

¶ The bread and wine for the Communion shall be provided by the Curate and the Churchwardens at the charges of the parish.

1549.

in the country, some one at the least of that house, in every parish, to whom by course, after the ordinance herein made, it appertaineth to offer for the charges of the Communion, or some other whom they shall provide to offer for them, shall receive the holy Communion with the Priest; the which may be the better done, for that they know before when their course cometh, and may therefore dispose themselves to the worthy receiving of the sacrament. And with him or them who doth so offer the charges of the Communion, all other who be then godly disposed thereunto shall likewise receive the Communion. And by this means the Minister, having always some to communicate with him, may accordingly solemnize so high and holy mysteries with all the suffrages and due order appointed for the same. And the Priest on the week-day shall forbear to celebrate the Communion, except he have some that will communicate with him.

Furthermore every man and woman to be bound to hear and be at the divine service, in the parish church where they be resident, and there with devout prayer or godly silence and meditation to occupy themselves; there to pay their duties, to communicate once in the year at the least, and there to receive and take all other sacraments and rites in this book appointed.

And whosoever willingly, upon no just cause, doth absent themselves, or doth ungodly in the parish church occupy themselves; upon proof thereof by the ecclesiastical laws of the realm to be excommunicate, or suffer other punishment, as shall to the ecclesiastical judge (according to his discretion) seem convenient.

And although it be read in ancient writers that the people many years past received at the priest's hands the sacrament of the body of Christ in their own hands, and no commandment of Christ to the contrary; yet forasmuch as they many times conveyed the same secretly away, kept it with them, and diversely abused it to superstition and wickedness; lest any such thing hereafter should be attempted, and that an uniformity might be used throughout the whole realm, it is thought convenient the people commonly receive the sacrament of Christ's body in their mouths at the Priest's hand.

1552.

¶ And note, that every parishioner shall communicate at the least three times in the year; of which Easter to be one; and shall also receive the sacraments and other rites, according to the order in this book appointed. And yearly at Easter every parishioner shall reckon with his Parson, Vicar, or Curate, or his or their deputy or deputies, and pay to them or him all ecclesiastical duties accustomably due then and at that time to be paid.

1559.

1662.

The same.

¶ And note, that every parishioner shall communicate at the least three times in the year, of which Easter to be one. And yearly at Easter every Parishioner shall reckon with the Parson, Vicar, or Curate, or his or their Deputy or Deputies; and pay to them or him all Ecclesiastical duties, accustomably due, then and at that time to be paid.

1549.

1552.

* Although no order can be so perfectly devised, but it may be of some, either for their ignorance and infirmity, or else of malice and obstinacy, misconstrued, depraved, and interpreted in a wrong part; and yet because brotherly charity willeth that so much as conveniently may be, offences should be taken away: therefore we are willing to do the same. Whereas it is ordained in the Book of Common Prayer, in the administration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants kneeling should receive the Holy Communion, which thing being well meant for a signification of the humble and grateful acknowledging of the benefits of Christ, given unto the worthy receiver, and to avoid the profanation and disorder which about the holy Communion might else ensue; lest yet the same kneeling might be thought or taken otherwise, we do declare that it is not meant thereby, that any adoration is done or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or to any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For as concerning the sacramental bread and wine, they remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians. And as concerning the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ, they are in heaven and not here. For it is against the truth of Christ's true natural body, to be in more places than in one at one time.

---

* This rubric does not appear in Cardwell's Liturgies Edward VI., see p. 317. The following note is appended to it in Liturgies of Edward VI., Parker Society, p. 283:—

"This paragraph is fourth in order in Grafton 2. It is printed on a separate leaf in other copies, and, as is evident from the signatures, was added afterwards. In Grafton 1, the leaf is pasted in after the copy was bound, and several copies are without it."

1559.

1662.

¶ After the Divine Service ended, the money given at the Offertory shall be disposed of to such pious and charitable uses, as the Minister and Churchwardens shall think fit. Wherein if they disagree, it shall be disposed of as the Ordinary shall appoint.

THE COMMUNION.

"Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy Receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue); yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved; It is hereby declared, that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians); and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."

ESSAY X.

PARTIES AND PARTY SPIRIT.

By JOHN S. HOWSON, D.D.,

Dean of Chester.

CONTENTS OF ESSAY X.

Combination for religious ends—Parties are necessary — their dangers — party leaders.

Our present parties—our obligations to the Evangelical body—good service done by the High Church party — the tendencies of Free Thought.

The evils of Party Spirit—illustration from the various criticisms of the Lambeth Conference — true estimate of the value of that meeting.

The Ritualist section of the High Church body — its disloyalty and mischievous tendency — its manifest affinity to the Modern Church of Rome — false views of the Eucharist—practice of the Confessional.

Faults of the Evangelical party—dangers inherent in their mode of procedure—isolation in regard to Churchmanship — narrowness in regard to Free Thought.

Appeal for the co-operation of all moderate men, whether Evangelicals or High Churchmen—a common ground for this in the Prayer-Book—the duty of forbearance and concession in smaller matters of rubrical observance.

In this argument no objection to a Revision of the Prayer-Book — no antagonism to the idea of the Reunion of Christendom—hopeful symptoms of our time — prevalent love of Hymns.

PARTIES AND PARTY SPIRIT.

HARDLY anything is more difficult than to define the exact point where combination for a supposed religious end ceases to be good and begins to be an absolute evil. Combination there must be, under most circumstances, in this bad world, for the securing of such a purpose. Victory can seldom be attained, at least in critical times, by solitary struggles. But, on the other hand, there cannot well be combination without party; and party involves great risks, both to truth and to charity. In party-action there must be mutual understandings and definite arrangements: and these require—we need not use the word compromise, for this would be to assume the very point at issue—but certainly some surrender of the individual will for the presumed general good. If there is resistance on the part of the individual will in matters of no essential importance, so that combination is made impossible, and the great end consequently lost, through perverse obstinacy or vanity or fanciful preferences, we feel no difficulty in condemning such resistance. But there are great dangers too on the opposite side. In order to make sure of combination serious convictions may be sacrificed: the judgment of those who unwillingly follow may really be better than the judgment of those who lead; and thus for the sake of victory the very thing is lost which alone makes victory valuable. Those, again, who at first have followed unwillingly may in time catch the enthusiasm of their party: passion then takes the place of judgment: combination is presently regarded as the end and not the means; and in this heat the high moral tone is evaporated, which ought to preside over all action for the public good.

We have unhappily not far to go for an illustration of this tendency of party-movement to degenerate into party-spirit. The spectacle presented by both Houses of Parliament, for some considerable time past, is a very uneasy subject for those who

are anxious for the real welfare of their country at home, and for its creditable reputation abroad. Parties have most evidently been outbidding one another for popular acceptance; while it is useless to deny that on both sides, in the midst of much energetic action, there has been a widespread absence of honest conviction. And now, in this present year, let any one take the pages of Hansard, and measure the space devoted in the speeches of both Houses, on either side, in mutual recrimination, and he will find too much reason for uncomfortable thoughts in regard even to the credit of Parliamentary Government.

In the present instance our subject is connected entirely with Religious Parties; and here it is peculiarly important to look on the moral aspects of the question. It is sometimes said that the chief danger, in matters of this kind, is to the foolish followers—the weak and second-rate men, who must necessarily be led by others,—or to the selfish followers, who may have something to gain by associating themselves under eminent leadership. But in truth, in all times of religious conflict, there are special moral risks to the leaders themselves. The temptation of a leader is to consider, not simply what is true, but what will produce an effect; to seize the first weapon that comes to hand, especially if he is conscious that he can wield it well; and not to inquire into methods too closely, if it appears likely that they will lead to success. Moreover each such leader is exposed to the moral dangers which are more peculiarly incident to his personal character. He may be endowed with too much subtlety or he may be beset by excessive vanity. A sensitive or overbearing temperament may have been pampered by applause; or the consciousness of exerting personal influence for years may have become so delightful, that a habit of something like intrigue may have been fostered and formed. The more closely we look into the matter, the more clearly we see how serious are the risks of party-action in the affairs of Religion. A leader demoralised under the influence of seductive temptations is a peril to the whole community. "If the blind lead the blind, shall they not both fall into the ditch?" Under the double action of inexcusable compliance on the one hand and unscrupulous leadership on the other, party-combination may become highly injurious to the most sacred interests. The party-combination, once

formed, may itself become the great object of care, and the enthusiasm, which grew up in connection with a good end, may continue and be developed, till it can with equal facility be made subservient to a bad end; or (which amounts to the same thing) such party-feeling and party-organization may become subservient to a policy of obstruction. This in fact is a most important part of our subject. If Party may, on the one hand, lead on to fanatical and mischievous extremes, it may, on the other, become a hindrance to necessary religious reforms, and obstinately forbid even the consideration of imperative subjects, simply because they are new, and at first sight not congenial with what has hitherto been accepted. A party leader, who has taken a certain attitude by mistake, finds it very difficult to alter his position without forfeiting the confidence of his followers; and foolish followers, who trusted a man in an unreasoning way when he was right, will equally trust him now that he is wrong, so long as he does not avow a change of opinion.

The result to which such a train of thought brings us is this: that if Religious Parties are inevitable, and in fact desirable, Party Spirit in Religion is a very great evil. Perhaps this rough distinction is as near an approach to a definition of the line between right and wrong, as is possible in regard to the matter before us. And now, though an abstract definition is impracticable, a few reflections on the subject, in the midst of the excitement which surrounds us, may possibly elucidate some practical and urgent duties in connection with particular questions. This line of distinction between the usefulness of Party and the mischief of Party Spirit may be taken as a thread to give some kind of coherence to thoughts, which, whatever they may be worth in themselves, are expressions of opinions not by any means hastily or recently formed. There is indeed, and there ought to be, a natural shrinking from the composition of a paper on this subject. The great objection to the publication of such remarks is this, that it is not easy either to write them or to read them without thinking of certain eminent and conspicuous men of our own day.* We live, however, at a very critical time;

* There is another obvious objection to such a paper as this. The writer, in attempting to criticise all parties fairly, might appear to hold himself superior to all of them. He must be content to bear such an imputation, and must take care that he does not deserve it.

and in the discharge of a public duty the fear of giving offence or of causing pain must sometimes be laid aside. The writer of such remarks as these can at least watch over his own spirit, so as to be sure that he is not himself under the influence of any feelings of personal animosity: and the reader may be asked to weigh impartially what is written, and to take it on its own merits, without imagining any such reference to individuals as would really be even more culpable than the party spirit, which is here so strongly blamed.

It is a matter of course to remark, in the first place, that there have always been in the Church of England, if not two great religious parties, yet two divergent and well-marked tendencies of religious thought: the one making much of historical precedent, and laying great stress on the outward means of grace and the corporate life of the Church; the other looking to the present rather than the past, having a repugnance to a rich ceremonial, preferring indeed to take Christianity on the side of doctrine rather than the side of worship, and more in its relation to the individual soul than to the community at large. Most impartial persons also (if any one can be impartial on such a subject) would say that the existence of these two parties or tendencies is an advantage, that it prevents stagnation of thought, that a certain amount of controversy is a good corrective of selfishness and conceit, and that, each side in this question being avowedly in possession of some portion of the whole truth, better justice is done to each such portion of truth by having its own warm adherents and partizans.

Moreover, it is not difficult to point out practical benefits, on a very large scale, which are due to the action of these two parties, and which in all probability would not equally have been realised had not the two diverging tendencies existed. Thus it would hardly be possible to exaggerate the good done by the Evangelical body in breaking up the sleep of the Church, in quickening dull consciences, in creating a high standard of religious life, and forcing men to think of the serious conditions of our present state of existence. And again, definite results of the highest value can be traced to this party—in the growth of Missionary exertion—in the abolition of the Slave-trade—in the extension of Pastoral Care—in the development of Lay-agency—in alleviating the hardships of Factory labour,

and in Reformatory work of various kinds. On the other side, those eyes must be very blind which cannot see the good service rendered during the last quarter of a century by the High Church party—in promoting more reverence in Public Worship—in calling back to the Sacraments some of that just attention which had not been given to them before—in the promotion of Sacred Learning—in correcting the spirit of isolation—and in giving us juster views of the high lineage which connects us with former ages. Nor is it difficult in this case, as in the other, to point to definite results of great importance. Our Church Music and Church Architecture are not what they were—the debates connected with such subjects as the "Offertory" and "Free Worship" have given us more serious thoughts of the rights of the poor—the special efficacy of Women in works of charity, and the need of discipline, method, and training, in regard to their work, are now generally acknowledged: few, too, would be found to regret that our complete Church organization has been supplied to the Colonies; and all these beneficial results are mainly due to the same origin. Human nature is such that we probably could not have had all these new advantages on both sides, now placed at our command, had it not been for the existence of party. Evangelicals and High Churchmen, though they have supposed themselves hostile to one another, have really been co-operating for our good: for they have both, in various ways, broken some of the conventional shackles of the past, and given us some excellent starting-points for the time to come.

There is yet another element to be taken into account, before even the merest outline of our religious divisions can be complete. There are actively at work amongst us certain tendencies which might be grouped together under the designation of Free Thought, inasmuch as they all represent a greater or less degree of independence, as opposed to adherence to any traditional school. And it would be very unjust not to acknowledge the benefits which are due to these tendencies. They have done good service, indirectly, by promoting a spirit of inquiry and caution, and thus diluting the fanaticism and correcting the follies into which traditional schools are apt to run. Moreover the community is under great obligations to men of this habit of mind for definite

results in works of exact Biblical Criticism and candid Ecclesiastical History, for diligent labour in the task of Education and the pursuit of Science, and for facing boldly those Social questions, which are continually becoming more urgent. It would be impossible, however, to speak of such authors and workers, and their followers and admirers, as constituting a Party. They are far too diverse to be permanently organized in this way. Thus, for instance, the present agitation concerning the Irish Church has had the effect of dividing them into two sections, one representing a desire that the establishment of that Church should continue, lest religious zeal should break out into fanaticism and faction, the other urgently recommending that State-connection in this instance should cease, in order that religious zeal may receive a fuller development.

Attempts indeed have been made to classify all these tendencies under one head by means of a party name.* But it is an evil to group together, by an accidental resemblance, those who really differ very much from one another. Of all party terms, those perhaps are the worst which rest upon a negation. The greatest possible injustice too is done by associating together, before the public eye, those who at one extremity of a great miscellaneous body are thoroughly Christian in their tone and habit of mind, and those at the other who, if they do not reject Revealed Truth, feel themselves quite at liberty to modify it into various forms. And here it must be observed that although those, to whom reference is here made, cannot properly be called a Party, they are by no means exempt, in some cases, from Party Spirit in its worst form, namely in the form of contempt and dislike. Those, in fact, who consider themselves free from partizanship are under a peculiar temptation to despise others. The horror of cant sometimes leads to the worst kind of cant. It is quite a mistake to suppose that those who are liberal in the sense of

* In an excellent and important paper on the 'Evangelical Clergy of 1868' (by the Rev. A. Thorold), published in the 'Contemporary Review' (August) after this Essay was in the printer's hands, the term "Liberals" is applied to those to whom reference is made in this paragraph. It is perhaps the best that could have been chosen, as being the most conciliatory. Every one who calls himself a "Liberal" feels that he has paid a compliment to himself. It is a noble word, too good to be applied to any mere Party.

caring little for the distinctions between truth and error are necessarily liberal in the sense of being fair and considerate and respectful towards those who have strong convictions. When a man's position is defined by a supposed superiority to the prejudices of others, he is in great danger of fostering "that Scorn which Wisdom holds unlawful." *

If Parties have been a benefit to the community, it is impossible to deny that Party Spirit is a great evil. And now, turning again to the two great religious bodies, which may truly be called parties, and while fully recognizing the advantages we have derived from both, we cannot fail to observe the existence of this spirit, to a very harmful extent, in both, and especially in one of them, at the present time.

Now what are the indications of Party Spirit? It is not very difficult to define them. One symptom of the disease is employment of violent and exaggerated language. The facts concerning which a statement is made may possibly be in substance true, while the words employed for the purpose are such as both to betray passion and to excite passion. Instances occur in abundance, almost every week, familiar to readers of polemical newspapers or hearers of polemical speeches. Another symptom, closely and in fact necessarily connected with the former, is unfairness in argument. In theological warfare it seems very seldom to be thought necessary to regard our Lord's rule of treating others as we should wish to be treated ourselves. And yet in a matter where His truth is concerned, it must surely be peculiarly imperative to state our opponent's case as he would wish it to be stated. One particular form of this unfairness, and the worst of all, is an unscrupulous disregard for the reputation of others. Slander appears to be viewed as a lawful weapon in religious conflict. Sometimes, for example, we see so great a zeal for the second commandment or the fourth, that the ninth is practically obliterated from the Decalogue. Sarcasm and the free use of nicknames constitute another form in which this bad spirit shows itself. We are well accustomed to this language now, especially as applied to Bishops. When we hear men called "Puritans," how well we

* Here, and elsewhere in this Essay, a few sentences are reproduced from a volume which was published by the writer in 1862, and which is now out of print.

know that it is not intended that they should receive any justice! When we hear the word "Popery," how well we know that the Church of Rome will not be treated calmly or fairly! Harsh and contemptuous words, too, are often most freely used by those who are least perfectly informed on the subject in hand. Such a phrase, for instance, as "Mediæval sacerdotalism" probably rings out most loudly from those who are profoundly ignorant of the true history of the Middle Ages; and, to turn suddenly to a totally different subject, but a very important one, both Evangelicals and High Churchmen frequently use language concerning those who are separated from the Church, which shows that they are hardly at all acquainted with the real thoughts and feelings of Non-conformists.

It must be added further that it is often in regard to little things that Party Spirit shows itself in the most vexatious and mischievous manner. Trivialities are indeed the best material for such puny warfare; but warfare on such ground is very vexatious to those who wish to take a grave view of Human Life and of the Christian Religion. It is also very mischievous: for such small matters are conspicuous and on the surface, and are for the most part connected with Public Worship. It becomes therefore important to speak strongly on some points which otherwise would not be worthy of notice. Allusion will be made further on in these pages to a few details of this kind.

But now, before proceeding to a more precise criticism of our religious parties, and in order to give point and definiteness to the remarks which have already been made, let us take as a basis for illustration, a recent event of considerable note, the Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops from all parts of the world. Each of our three schools has fastened upon this event in an eager and characteristic way. With the High Church party it was the occasion for eager exultation. In their eyes it was a Synod or a Council. "Behold," it was said, "here in the nineteenth century is one of the ancient ecclesiastical assemblies again: prelates meet once more and enunciate the faith." One might have thought that the world was to be conquered, from Vermont to Caffraria, because Bishops had spoken. But a voice is heard on the other side with a very different commentary on the same proceeding. "Behold, here is the beginning of a great system of hierarchical pretension: we can trace here a secret and

cunning conspiracy: the Liberties of the People and the Royal Supremacy are both evidently threatened: the separation of the Church from the State, and the establishment of a Clerical tyranny is the conclusion to which all this most evidently tends." But there was a third line of criticism, rather derisive than serious, with which we were made familiar last year. Here again, however, we are rather confused when we come among the varying tendencies of Free Thought. All shades of sentiment in regard to this matter might be traced in the periodical press. Some, who think it best for the Church to be immovably bound in the fetters of State-connection, naturally regarded this meeting as a fanatical impertinence. Others preferred to view it as a social gathering of a very unimportant and indeed somewhat ridiculous character. To some persons again who seem to regard Christianity as a mere sentiment, which they would wish to see merged and diluted in the general stream of secular thought, such an occasion was almost irritating. "Behold, here is the theological view of human life again weakly attempting to disturb the victorious progress of scientific ideas." With whatever varieties, the comments on the Lambeth Conference from the side of Free Thought were obviously marked by the common feature of Contempt.

Now what would have been a juster and more reasonable view of the whole subject than any of the three views which have just been stated? Other men, who are conscious of a common interest, and who find that they have difficulties and dangers in common, meet together without being blamed. Why should Bishops be precluded from such consultations? Are their anxieties so slight, or is their wisdom so superhuman, that they can secure no advantage by coming together? Have they nothing to learn from one another? May not those who represent the stiff and constrained arrangements of England, gain some benefit, or possibly confer some benefit, in conference with those who represent the perfectly free system of America, or the semi-establishments of the Colonies?* Moreover, few men are of opinion that our ecclesiastical arrangements can continue precisely the same as at present for a long period to come: and surely it must be the part of wisdom to prepare, whether for sud-

* It is a cause of permanent regret to very many, that five out of the seven prelates of our Northern Province were unable to be present.

den shocks, or for gradual change, by establishing a good mutual understanding among those on whom the chief responsibility rests. There is an advantage, under such circumstances, even in the mere forming of mutual acquaintance: and when modern facilities give new opportunities for such a purpose, it does not seem very unreasonable to use them. And, to pass to a higher view, it must be productive of some benefit in our time, that the various Churches of the Anglican Communion should have become more conscious than before, alike of their identity with one another, and of the continuity, both of doctrine and ministry, which binds them with the Churches of the Early Ages. If Presbyterians or Methodists had met in this way, from all parts of the earth, probably very little of this partizan criticism would have been provoked. But Bishops are always blamed, whether they do too much or too little. In this case they have been found fault with, both for attempting what was too great for their sphere and for wasting their time on a merely trivial business. The two accusations are clearly contradictory. But in fact, the moderation which marked the whole proceeding was one of its best features. Nor is it by any means likely that its results will be inconsiderable. To take one instance: there is reason to know that among those in Italy, who are struggling towards the light and anxious for a Reformation of their Church on Primitive principles, the letter issued by the Lambeth Conference has produced a sympathy and encouragement, which at this moment are peculiarly valuable.

Now, to leave these more general remarks, it is easy to say which party among ourselves, at the present moment, is the most thoroughly organized, the most active, and the most violent. The allusion is of course to the High-Church party: not however to that body as a whole, but to the extreme section of it. Very great differences subsist among those who would agree to call themselves High-Churchmen. And one danger of the willing adoption of this nomenclature, is lest those who acknowledge it in their own case, should gradually be drawn on to assimilation with excesses which they at present deplore. One chief purpose, in fact, of these pages is to urge the co-operation of such men with those who have a different designation, but with whom they have far more sympathy than with the extreme men of their own camp.

In comparison with the Ritualists hardly any other party in the Church of England can be said to exist, while they certainly exhibit some of the worst faults of a party: and those who have watched the progress of controversy during the last few years have noticed the diligent use made of two convenient opportunities for manifesting these faults. In the recent Church Congresses—at Norwich—at York—at Wolverhampton—no pains have been spared to create the impression that this party is very powerful. We all know how great an effect can be produced by a small body of men, if they have a definite aim, and if they are resolute and unscrupulous. We have seen this lately in the case of the Fenians. In making these remarks concerning the use made of Church Congresses, it is important to add that the younger men have been in some degree kept in check by the leaders. Still it has been the evident policy of the majority of the party, by means of noisy demonstrations and incessant activity, to convey through the newspapers an impression that they represented the general sentiment of these meetings, and therefore of the Church at large. And to a certain extent they have succeeded, aided, as they have been, by the culpable remissness or reluctance of the Evangelical party in regard to these public occasions. But such an impression is untrue, even as respects these meetings themselves. It is ludicrously untrue as respects the general body of the Church. This extreme party is in fact very small. But it is determined and incessantly active. This can be further seen by observing how diligently its members employ the Press in every direction.* Books and papers of all kinds are issued in furtherance of the cause. Essays of the most startling character are published without any reserve. The newspapers of the party have their articles well seasoned for a morbid public appetite. Devotional books, with the distinctive characteristics of the school, are circulated through channels more or less clandestine. This kind of

* It is by no means implied that it is wrong to make use of the Press in furtherance of our religious views. On the contrary, it is a duty to use it diligently. No better illustration of this feeling could be given than the course adopted by the Wesleyan Conference during the present year. Not only the London papers, but almost every paper at least in the North of England, contained day by day for a considerable period carefully prepared and communicated articles; and the result has been, no doubt, the creation of a general and timely impression of the great strength of the Wesleyan body, on the eve of the meeting of a Reformed Parliament.

propagandism, with its recklessness and versatility, is extremely likely to gain many adherents. It becomes therefore very important to form a right estimate of the principles of the party and a clear view of the ultimate results to which it tends.

Now there really need be no hesitation in using strong language concerning the end at which this party, in its most advanced and concentrated form, practically aims, and the source from which it draws its inspiration. Those who have carefully watched all these symptoms cannot have much doubt upon the subject. The Modern Church of Rome is the great central body which gives strength to the party. Here is the fulcrum on which its lever rests. The whole style of phraseology is recognised at once by those who are familiar with Roman Catholic books. And in this, it may be added, is one of the great marks of the spirit of Party. An attempt is made to alter even the vernacular language of the Church of England: and a corresponding duty rests on faithful members of the Church to resist this tendency. So with the attitudes and accessories of Public Worship. The affinity is so close as practically to be identity. As to any stress being laid on the difference between vestments of Sarum and vestments of Rome, this is evidently mere trifling. The true import of the movement is quite evident, and has for some time been clearly discerned by the most acute and judicial minds amongst us.* What degree of actual intercourse may be going on between the influential men of this party and the authorities and clergy of the Church of Rome it is impossible to say: and no accusations on this subject ought to be made at random. This, however, must have attracted the notice of every one, that great advances in the

* "Nothing, in my judgment, can be more mischievous, as well as in more direct contradiction to notorious facts, than to deny or ignore the Romeward tendency of the movement."—Bishop of St. David's 'Charge at his Ninth Visitation' (1866), p. 115. And this is not a mere opinion, but is supported by an array of facts (see pp. 92, 95). An earlier passage is much to our purpose, and may be quoted here:—"I entirely differ from those who regard the dispute as in itself of little moment, and unworthy of serious attention, because it relates immediately to things so trifling as the form and colour of garments to be worn and ceremonies to be observed in Divine Service. . . . . At the very lowest estimate, no man of practical sense can deem it a light matter, if a change is made in the externals of public worship, such as to give a new aspect to the whole. Such a transformation must needs be the effect of some powerful cause, and the cause of some important effect. Nothing less than the future character and destiny of the Church of England may be involved in the issue of the movement now in progress."—Pp. 73, 74.

Romeward direction have been made of recent years, and that the party of those who tend that way has been much more definitely concentrated and more highly organized than it used to be.

There is a great contrast, in several particulars, between the present and the old Oxford movement. When the 'Tracts for the Times' were coming out, all then was decorum, reverence, and reserve. Everything was said, as it were, under the breath, lest a liberty should be taken with sacred things. Now everything is popular, clamorous, and democratic. All arts of pleasing seem to be approved, if only they are successful. Then was a time of close study and solid learning. Now we are met on every side by what is showy and superficial. Then the great English Divines —Laud, Andrewes, Cosin—were the standards set before us. Now we hear nothing of "the first five centuries," or of "the Catholic Church before the division of East and West." Nothing, in fact, is more despised than that which calls itself merely Anglican. Then it was "Popular Protestantism" that was blamed and opposed. Now "Protestantism" pure and simple is the hateful word, against which bitter enmity and scorn are directed. The party is most clearly ranged side by side with the Modern Church of Rome in its opposition to everything else. This would be a serious matter at any time: and it is a peculiarly serious matter just now, when intercourse with the Continent is become so easy and so frequent, and when the Church of Rome itself is moving on so remarkably in a course of new and overbearing development. The closer and more easy contact of nearly all classes in this country with Continental countries is a fact to be pondered in regard to many questions of morals and theology. The Sunday question need only be mentioned to make us conscious of its importance. When we take so many collateral influences into account, it becomes more evidently our duty to be on the alert in resisting a party, the success of which would either gradually assimilate the Church of England to the Church of Rome, so that union would take place on Tridentine principles, or would take off a large portion of our people into that Church, leaving the rest of the community disorganized and weakened by controversy.

It is partly an instinctive sense of this danger which has roused throughout the country so great a repugnance to the

movement. This repugnance is shared, too, both by educated theologians and by the ordinary thinkers who are guided simply by the strong instincts of free Englishmen. With the former, who are acquainted with the recognised works of Moral Theology in the Church of Rome, it is no wonder if they are inspired with a profound distrust when they find themselves within the penumbra of that Church.* And as to the latter, for them the main points of this controversy are summed up in the Ultra-Sacerdotal theory, which, if generally accepted, would reverse the history of our country. This theory practically presents itself under two main aspects, on each of which a few words may now be said. Other parts of this wide subject are dealt with in this volume by independent minds. Some very simple thoughts on the Eucharist and on the Confessional may be allowed to find a place here.

It is remarkable that, in the early part of the High Church movement, theological discussions had a tendency to connect themselves with one of the two Sacraments, and that now our chief ecclesiastical debates are associated with the other. We hear but little now, in the way of controversy, concerning Holy Baptism. It seems to have fallen comparatively into the shade: as, indeed, is but natural; for such is the case in the Modern Church of Rome. The Holy Communion is at present the one great topic set before us in connection both with the power of the Priesthood and with our acts of Worship. But, indeed, it is not now chiefly as a "Communion" at all that this Sacrament is set before us, but rather as a "Sacrifice,"

* It is enough here to refer to a paper in the 'Catholic Layman' (July 19, 1855), printed after a very important article in the 'Christian Remembrancer' on Liguori's Theory of Truthfulness had been reviewed both in the 'Rambler' and the 'Dublin Review.' It is remarked here that "the method of the Jesuit moral theology is to lay down a rule, strict enough to satisfy the demands of the strictest of theorists, and then to eat out the heart of the rule with exceptions numerous enough to permit the laxest of practice." Thus it is a heinous sin to tell a lie: but for a good reason, as in order to preserve things good for the spirit or useful to the body, we may use equivocation. We may employ a word in one sense, when we know that the hearer understands in a totally different sense. A sentence may have two meanings: for example, "This book is Peter's" may mean either that Peter is the owner of it or the writer of it; and we may take advantage of this ambiguity. Or if it is expedient to conceal a thing, we may answer, "I say No," meaning, "I pronounce the word *No*." The article in the 'Christian Remembrancer' (by the Rev. F. Meyrick) was afterwards published, with notices of the review, in the 'Rambler' and the 'Dublin Review,' and ought to be widely known and carefully read.

in which the merely human priest practically makes propitiation for the people. The former is the view set before us in the Bible and the Prayer-Book: the latter is the Modern view, which is pressed upon us by all the accessories that can make it attractive. It is of the utmost consequence that careful attention should be given to this simple contrast. It will be observed that in these remarks there is no depreciation suggested of the value of the Sacraments as "effectual" signs of grace*—no mere Zwinglian theory advocated that would reduce Communion into mere Commemoration—no doubt expressed as to the close and peculiar Presence of Christ with every worthy recipient. What is urged is simply this, that the Roman Catholic or Ritualist view of the Lord's Supper is not taken out of the Bible, but imported into it, and that it is not in harmony with our Services or our Articles. Let any one fresh from the pages of the New Testament look at the system as maturely developed in the Church of Rome; and can he fail to be startled by the discrepancy? Is it not really a shocking perversion so to have altered this Sacred Feast, in which all true Christians realised their union with their Lord and with one another, as to have made it a Sacrifice dependent on the will of the Priest who receives his fee, so that those who pay the greatest amount of money are supposed to obtain, for themselves or their friends, the greatest amount of benefit? And as to the opposition between this system and the Prayer-Book, it would be almost a waste of time to quote collects, rubrics, and articles. We might rest the case on that part of our Authorised Formularies which is usually considered most favourable to the Ritualist view, and compare the words used among ourselves and in the Roman Church in the ordaining of a priest, after hands have been laid on his head. In the one case the Bible is given, with the Commission to "preach the Word of God and minister the Holy Sacraments;" in the other the Cup and Paten are given, with authority to offer "Sacrifices for the Living and the Dead."†

* Art. xxv.

† The contrast is well seen if we put the passages side by side, with the accompanying rubrics. "*Then* (after the laying on of hands) *the Bishop shall deliver to every one of them, kneeling, the Bible into his hand, saying:* Take thou Authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the Holy Sacraments in the Congregation, where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto."—'Form and Manner of

With this sharp contrast in view, and feeling that we have a firm position both on Biblical and on Liturgical grounds, we are bound to oppose novelties of ceremonial, which tend to introduce amongst us the Roman view of the Eucharist. Such is the custom, which under other circumstances would be harmless, of encouraging non-communicants to remain during the celebration, under the notion that they receive benefit by passively "assisting" at a "sacrifice." Such, again, are the vestments, which are at present causing so much tumult. Not indeed that attempts to give richness and beauty to public worship are to be blamed: but whatever is the drapery of a false doctrine, and avowedly adopted to make that doctrine attractive, must deserve opposition.* And in connection with these showy accessories of the highest act of public worship another remark must be made, which is of considerable importance. In the palmy days of the 'British Critic' it used to be said that "Protestantism is the religion of corrupt human nature." But on the other side it is very difficult to help remarking on the very facile connection which seems to subsist between ornate Eucharistic ceremonial and the world of Fashion. It is quite true that there is often among extreme High Churchmen a noble austerity and a self-denial that may well be an example to some of their opponents. Nevertheless, among disciples of this school there seems not unfrequently to be an extreme triviality of mind,† which finds its opportunities equally and alternately in exciting

---

Ordering of Priests.' "*Tum tradit cuilibet successivè Calicem cum vino et aqua, et Patenam superpositam cum Hostia, Pontifice singulis dicente,* Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo, Missasque celebrare, tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis."—'Pontific. Rom.' (Par. 1664) p. 50.

* It will be seen that a different view is taken here from that expressed by Professor Plumptre (pp. 337-340) in a copious and thoughtful Essay on "Church Parties. Past, Present, and Future," recently published in the 'Contemporary Review' (March, 1868). There is this difference between the Ritualist enthusiasm of our time and the Wesleyan enthusiasm of the last century, that the latter was far more in harmony with the general principles of the English Church as settled at the Reformation and on the whole maintained since.

† In illustration of the mixture of triviality and materialism which characterises some members of this school, the following letter (printed in a theological paper on Oct. 16, 1867) is quoted with some reluctance. "I find it very easy, although I have mustachios, to receive the Blood at the Holy Communion into my mouth without desecration, if the chalice is given into my hands; otherwise it is very difficult. Last Sunday I communicated at a Ritualistic Church, and through the officiating clergyman keeping the chalice in his hands I was utterly unable to receive my Lord's atoning Blood except in a manner which, for a moment, led me to wish that the Roman use was in force among us."

amusement and in the display connected with the deepest religious mysteries. This in itself is a great condemnation of the system; for true Christianity in its highest forms was never fashionable.

The Confessional is another subject to which a similar line of argument may be applied. The *habit* of confessing to a priest has no countenance either from the New Testament or from the Prayer-Book. That the seeking of confidential "ghostly advice" is in many cases very important, cannot be doubted. The temptations of young men, for instance, in a luxurious age, may well lead to many serious and private conversations with Clergymen who can be trusted. Nor can it be denied that the Prayer-Book, in a certain qualified way, does give encouragement to Confession in some instances. Here perhaps we are obliged to occupy a defensive position in regard to one or two passages in the Book of Common Prayer, which, taken alone, without their proper explanatory circumstances, might be erected into an argument for the systematic Confessional. But a consideration of the whole environment of these passages, especially when the expressed opinions of those who compiled our services are remembered, shows that the cases for which provision is thus made are entirely exceptional. On a broad view of the matter, it may be truly asserted that nothing is more contrary to the spirit of the Reformation than a general prevalence of Private Confession followed by Priestly Absolution. And as to Scripture, such a system as that of the Church of Rome in this respect is clearly baseless. To quote in defence of it our Lord's words to the healed leper* is quite irrelevant; and St. James's precept regarding the mutual confession of sin† is a strong argument in the other direction.

The practical results of a wide extension of the system among ourselves would be very serious. And a reference may here be made to a very important side of our whole subject. Perhaps the best part of the religious work to which the High Church party has given rise is the work of Sisterhoods. No words of respect can be too strong in acknowledgment of the beautiful devotion of the women who are thus engaged in helping the sorrowful and recovering the lost. But in propor-

* Matt. viii. 4. † Jam. v. 16.

tion as Sisterhoods are made subservient to the Confessional, great risks are involved both to themselves and to society.* There is nothing of which the English people is more jealous than secresy in matters of religion, and priestly interference in domestic life. And just now no circumstances are more perilous than those which encourage separation of feeling between the Clergy and the Laity. In the midst of much activity and much readiness for useful service, it cannot be denied that a very serious discouragement and despondency has been, during the last few years, coming over the minds of English Laymen. There are various symptoms of this, and various causes for it. But undoubtedly one cause is a distrust regarding the Ultra-Sacerdotal tendencies of the time, as shown in the encouragement of the Confessional, and in new and obnoxious forms of Ritual. They are determined that England shall not be brought under the old yoke again; but they are not sure regarding the changes which are coming over the mind of the English Church. It seems then a most evident duty to point out where the danger lies, and to counteract it in good time. Legislation can be of little use, except in regard to what is merely external. If there is a combination for mischievous ends—for revolutionising our Church—and for sacrificing our liberties—this must be met by a counter-combination; not, it is confidently submitted, by the formation of a counter-*party* using the same polemical and extreme methods, but by general co-operation and good mutual understanding among all moderate men. And if it is clearly seen that we are all threatened by a serious danger in one particular quarter, it may be hoped that some, whose apparent sanction increases the danger, will draw off from an association which is not really natural to them, and that they will be met by the sympathy of others who are quite at one with them in desiring to see the Church of England prosperous and strong.

But the other side of our mixed community has been guilty

* That a defined and recognised dress is of great importance, where women are professionally set apart to a life of charity, is quite well known to all who have studied the subject. But great harm has been done by palpable imitations of Romanism in this respect. And to argue in favour of any costume, that, with this obvious general resemblance, it differs in some very small particular from any existing costume in the Church of Rome, is to make the matter worse: for such an argument approaches very near to an insult.

too; and not only so, but it has also been in some considerable measure the cause of the reactionary extravagances which have just been criticised. Let us look quietly now at this other side, and sum up the case against the Evangelical party, not hastily or angrily, and certainly not, as has too often been done, in any sarcastic or contemptuous spirit. Those who read this Essay will easily perceive that the writer's sympathies and convictions have a closer connection with this party than with any other. And especially must this sympathy be expressed with regard to one great principle which has always characterised the Evangelical body, namely the assigning of paramount importance to religious efforts for individual souls, as opposed to dwelling too much on what may be called collective Christianity, and on those outward means which are valuable only so far as they are used for spiritual ends. It cannot be too carefully recollected that the Gospel is a remedial system, and that in order to do its work effectually it must be brought to bear immediately on separate souls. Moreover a very large part of this work must be done by the direct application of that Truth, which, revealed once for all at the first, has been permanently preserved in Scripture; while one great method of doing this must be by Oral Communication. It is quite possible that all this may be neglected, or thrown into the shade, while yet there is great activity in outward religious work, and great fervour in outward religious services. Now it has been the honour and merit of the Evangelical party to hold fast to the central reality as opposed to the subsidiary methods. But from this very exclusiveness of view—from too much forgetfulness of those methods—from too great a disregard of the conditions under which the Truth is to find its way to various minds, and from the temptations inevitably incident to its own mode of procedure—from these causes have, in a great measure, sprung the past defects and the present weakness of this party. It is hoped that some part of this process may be pointed out frankly, without giving needless offence.

Even without reference to any particular views of religious truth or religious institutions, the mode of procedure which is natural from the Evangelical starting-point must involve some danger of party mischief. There must, in the first place, be some tendency to isolation, arising from this high and exclusive aim at the production of spiritual life, and from natural want of

sympathy with those who are presumed to be too much occupied with what is external and superficial. And this isolation cannot fail to result, more or less, in Party Spirit. In proportion as Evangelical Churchmen are separated from the rest of the world, while at the same time they are occupied with interests of high importance, a peculiar phraseology with conventional watchwords will almost necessarily come into existence. And all this is mischievous, because it impedes mutual acquaintance, creates misunderstandings, and prevents co-operation among those who do not really differ, though they seem to do so. It is mischievous, too, because it tends, not merely to party organization in the general sense, but to the formation of little sets of admirers round party leaders, whether in the form of congregations attached to favourite preachers, or of social groups, which, being satisfied with themselves and with their idol, learn a most injurious habit of self-complacency.

The evil too is much enhanced by the fact that in these circles, by the very nature of the case, the general method of acting on the minds of others is by public addresses, whether from the Pulpit or on the Platform. And here a remark may be made on a popular fallacy, which has been productive of much mischief, arising out of a restricted interpretation of the word "preach," as used in the English Bible. Undoubtedly this word is constantly employed in the New Testament to describe the communication of the Gospel to human souls. It is also true that in modern English the word is limited to oral addresses made by one person to an assembly, as from a pulpit or platform. Hence it is assumed that this is the one great authorised and effectual method of exciting spiritual life. But even the English term has only recently narrowed itself to this restricted application. And the words in the original, so translated, are in fact various, some having reference merely to private conversation, some denoting the communication of joyful tidings by any method.* It is obvious that such communication may often be most usefully made in writing: and it might have been thought that those who have so high a reverence for the letter of Scripture would have included the

* In Acts xx. 7, 9, the word used implies conversation. In Acts viii. 35 the reference is clearly to conversationof the most private kind.

written and printed Epistles of St. Paul among the methods (to use his own phrase) "of manifesting the word through preaching."* But a fallacy connected with a Biblical phrase has an extraordinary power and tenacity, and it gives an opportunity of settling a question at once by an apparently authoritative statement. It is obvious that if an error of this kind is accepted as a truth, it must tend to give power and permanence to whatever evils are connected with the oral mode of communicating religious impressions to large assemblies; and that the evils lurk side by side with the benefits cannot be doubted by any thoughtful man.

George Herbert says that "Sermons are dangerous things;" and never was any saying more true. Especially are sermons dangerous to the preachers themselves. To have collected an admiring congregation—to be sure of obtaining attention—to know that what is said will be accepted by large numbers, not because they have well considered it, but because it is put before them with grace and with force,—this must involve no ordinary temptation to the speaker. No doubt some corrective is furnished by general public opinion. Remarks, often unjustly severe remarks, are made in abundance just now concerning sermons. But such remarks are directed against unsuccessful preachers. It is the successful preacher who is beset by moral danger. In the pulpit he has everything his own way. As the matter has been amusingly put, there is "no counsel for the defendant;" and the preacher, while applauded by the unreasoning many, may little know what harm he has done to the thoughtful few, by exaggerations or unfair omissions. And as with the Pulpit, so with the Platform. There is a great absence of salutary discipline for the orator in the eager flutter of an expectant assembly. It is no wonder if he yields to the temptation of the moment, and gratifies himself by gratifying those who already agree with him. And then in the satisfied feeling that he has done well for his own cause he never discovers that he might have done much better for the Church. These things are willingly tolerated when a speaker is popular; but

* Tit. i. 3. So in 1 Cor. i. 21 "the foolishness of preaching" has no special reference to the pulpit, though it is often referred to it in such a way as to provoke a smile. The Apostle is saying that "the revealed and proclaimed Wisdom," which men presume to call "Folly," is the means of "saving them that believe."

the harm which results is great. It is impossible to doubt that large numbers of our most religious people are now utterly weary of the platform. There is indeed a danger lest such a feeling should take an unjust form. Religious Meetings, like Popular Lectures, have done good service in their day, and, like them, will do good service again. But as Popular Lectures can never take the place of Education, so neither can Public Addresses of any kind be a substitute for Pastoral Work; and, in the very nature of the case, a risk of delusion in this respect is inherent in the Evangelical methods. With whom, however, is victory likely to remain, with the Roman Catholic Sisters of Mercy in their gentle labours of love among families unvisited by their own Pastors, or with the eloquent speaker at a Protestant Meeting, from which Roman Catholics are absent?* Is not such a question a severe, but just, commentary on Solomon's saying, that "in all labour there is profit, but the talk of the lips tendeth only to penury?"

But to turn now from methods to opinions, and taking the Evangelical party first on the side which it presents towards the High Church party, a separation of feeling has taken place through each of them looking too exclusively on one of two different aspects of Christian truth. Some difference of view in matters of this kind is probably a necessity inherent in human nature: but there ought to be mutual forbearance and a readiness to work together, if it is possible. Each side, too, must admit at least a limited possession of truth on the other side. Some may be disposed to lay stress on church life, some on individual life: but both are realities: nor can it in fairness be said that those who make the former prominent are indifferent to the latter. But it is assumed that strong divergences exist. A certain amount of feeling is excited. So these questions pass into controversial forms. Then begin the evil effects of Party Spirit. Liberties are taken with Scripture itself. Texts are distorted. Some are left out on one side: exclusive stress is laid on others.† Divine truth, for example,

* A reference to p. 346 will show that the writer is very far from charging neglect of Pastoral Care as a general fault on the Evangelical party, nor is any doubt expressed as to the absolute duty, in many cases, of taking an active part in Protestant meetings.

† Advantage is often taken in controversy, either disingenuously or ignorantly, of casual errors in our Authorised Version. Thus, if Heb. xiii. 4 is quoted as decisive against Clerical

is frequently obscured by applying to a supposed invisible Church passages of Scripture which are clearly addressed to a visible and mixed body. The first Epistle to the Corinthians supplies a good opportunity for testing the truth of this remark. We are there reminded* that if individually we are "the temple of God," we are so collectively too. Both statements are true, and neither ought to be ignored; nor can one of them be properly merged into the other.

And as with Scriptural passages relating to the Church, so with others relating to the Sacraments. Perhaps it would hardly be possible to confirm any statement by a stronger array of texts than the assertion of the Church Catechism that the Sacrament of Baptism consists of "two parts."† But how often do we find in controversy that the "outward and visible sign" is entirely dropped out of view, and the word "Baptism" so spiritualised as to be made to mean what the original readers of the New Testament could not possibly have understood it to mean. It is one thing to say that only the "inward and spiritual grace" saves us, quite another thing to say that "Baptism" *is* the inward and spiritual grace. The only consistent result to which such a line of interpretation leads is the Quaker view. Concerning the other Sacrament, remarks have necessarily been made in connection with another part of the subject before us. But in reference to both ordinances, wherever there has been a tendency to reduce them to mere forms, and to argue that any other forms, if appointed, would have served the purpose equally well, this consideration ought to occur to the mind, that, in a Religion so spiritual, so free from any cumbrous weight of outward observances, the mere fact of the appointment of these observances at all invests them with peculiar importance and solemnity.

Celibacy, how evidently is occasion given for the old retort: "See how the Protestants use deceit in supplying the verbe substantive that wanteth, making it the indicative mood, where the verbe to be supplied ought rather to be the imperative mode, that so the speach may be an exhortation to them that be or wil be married."—'The New Testament faithfully translated into English out of the authentical Latin: by the English Colledge in Rhemes' (1633), p. 587. But, to give an instance on the other side, what undue advantage has often been taken of John x. 16, where "fold" ought to be "flock."

* 1 Cor. iii. 16, vi. 19.

† Let any one write down the following passages and calmly look at them together, Joh. iii. 5; Acts xxii. 16; 1 Cor. vi. 11; Eph. v. 26; Tit. iii. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 21, and he will obtain a view of the analogy of Scripture on this point, and he will hardly be disposed to allegorise Col. ii. 12, or the beginning of our Collect for Easter Even.

But now,—to turn from the Bible to the Prayer-Book,—certainly nothing could be more unjust than to place any defects or deviations of the Evangelical body, in regard to rubrical matters, on the same level of blame as the proceedings of the Ritualists. The former have been for a very long period sanctioned by the Bishops and by public opinion, and have no connection with any ulterior revolutionary scheme. The latter are part of a plan for undoing the Reformation. Still there has been on the Evangelical side a good deal of partizan-argumentation, in these matters, which it would be wise now entirely to lay aside. Take the case of continuing the Morning Service, according to rubrical instructions, by using the "Prayer for the Church Militant" after the Sermon. To say that this is an inconvenient mode of closing the service; that it lengthens a time already too long; that ending with the sermon is better liked by the people, and not forbidden by the Ordinary; and that, in the absence of any formal power of reconstruction, such a deviation is quite in harmony with the spirit of the Prayer-Book; this is most fair and reasonable. But for men to say that they will not use this Prayer, because it is "Tractarian" to do so, this is an evident indication of Party Spirit. Moreover, it implies a mistake; for nothing could well be more "Protestant" than this emphatic prominence given to the "Militant" Church, as opposed to the offering up of Prayers for the Dead. Such is not fair handling of our authorised manual of public worship: and all unfairness in controversy is peculiarly likely to produce a recoil in a conscientious mind, and to strengthen the cause which it was meant to resist. The influence of the Evangelical body has been weakened in this way, and especially perhaps has this effect resulted from their frequent disregard of those days in the Prayer-Book, for which a special Collect, with Epistle and Gospel, has been provided. Even in respect of such a Festival as Ascension Day,* with all its affluence of edifying thought, and all its assertion of most important facts, has this been too often the case. From causes

* Will it be said that congregations will not come? But if Clergymen, after duly preaching on the subject, and urging the propriety of observing the Church's regulations, fail to obtain congregations at such a time, their influence over their flocks must be very small. For this day, too, a "Proper Preface" is appointed in the Communion Office. Yet in how many churches is the Holy Communion never administered on this day!

like these an impression has been created, however unjustly, that in some quarters there is a disposition rather to patronise, than to obey, the Book of Common Prayer.

And defects of the Evangelical party are similarly apparent on the side which it presents to the advocates of Free Thought. A high estimate of Scripture being combined with a low estimate of Church Authority, the two together lead to a technical view of Inspiration, which, being asserted and not proved, is taken to be axiomatic. Through a certain impatience of thought the proofs of the Divine Origin of Christianity are assumed to be *ipso facto* proofs of the Verbal Inspiration of the Bible. Thus the indignation naturally caused by deniers of the former is easily transferred so as to be directed against those who question the latter. And this must clearly have an irritating effect, because it is felt to be an injustice. So alienation ensues: and those who might have worked together believe that they are enemies. In another direction, too, the Evangelicals have often been much to blame, namely in their treatment of the claims of Science. Sometimes it seems to be assumed that all scientific men are puffed up with pride; whereas scientific men are often very modest and humble. But it is the general mode in which Science has been too often dealt with by this party, which must be especially pointed out as full of danger. Science is necessarily impatient of assumptions. Induction can never stand still. Thus if a fixed barrier is presented to scientific inquiry by traditional interpretations of Scripture, an uneasy state of things cannot fail to result, with a tendency on the part of scientific minds to reject Revelation, and a tendency too on the part of Biblical students themselves to distrust the Bible. Who can say what harm has been done by denunciations against Geology, which were heard a few years ago from some of our pulpits,—denunciations which would perhaps now be willingly retracted by those who made them? This ought to be a warning against precipitate assertion in regard to those Ethnological and Anthropological questions which are now causing anxiety. The wisdom of the Christian student is to wait patiently for the solution of problems in which Science is concerned. He ought not to be surprised that there should be a period of unsettlement, when attention is directed very closely—perhaps too exclusively—to physical phenomena;

and he ought to remember that it is difficult to conceive of a revelation which should harmonise with all states of scientific progress in the human mind.

And, to turn once more from Physical Science to Holy Scripture, it must be added that there has often been great want of candour in the mode adopted by the Evangelical party of treating the Biblical criticism of the Continent. What, for instance, can be more unreasonable than to mislead, or to be misled, by such a partizan phrase as "the school of German Theology," as if there were not in Germany a greater multitude of theological varieties than among ourselves? And justice requires a further remark to be made. To say nothing of the obligations of English writers (and of some who do not acknowledge it) to the acuteness and depth of German criticism, it must be added that practical Christianity in Protestant religious families on the Continent often takes a simpler form, and is far less under the influence of the world, than among the Evangelical party in England.* We touch here another and a serious subject, which cannot be quite omitted in summing up the case on this side. Popularity and Prosperity are dangerous to any party, especially when the ascetic element† is not very carefully retained. It can hardly be denied that worldliness in certain forms has infused itself into the Evangelical body; and harm is sure to result, if it can be said with any fairness (as certainly it often is said) that, side by side with a warm and elevated devotional language there is here no greater indifference than elsewhere to family interests, to ecclesiastical preferment, and to comfortable self-indulgence. One great secret of the strength of the extreme High Church party is to be found

---

* Some proof of the excellence of much of the practical religious work among Continental Protestants is afforded by Dr. De Liefde's 'Six Months among the Charities of Europe' (1865), also by Mr. Stevenson's little book, entitled 'Praying and Working.'

† There is ground for serious regret, that the word "asceticism" has not retained with us, as it has in Germany, its old signification of practical Christian self-discipline. The history of the deterioration of this word, the false impression associated with it by our self-indulgent Christianity, and its injurious reaction on that Christianity afterwards, would form a very useful study. This whole subject is dealt with far too carelessly by many of the Evangelical party. Thus "fasting" is sometimes said to be a word of uncertain meaning, notwithstanding such passages as Matt. xv. 32, Luke v. 33. Sometimes again it is said that fasting should only be practised when suggested by inward grief. But what then becomes of the regulation of the Church of England, which recommends it at fixed seasons?

in the self-denial and hard work with which it is often associated. The confidence of those who do not think deeply will inevitably turn towards that quarter, in which there appears to be the greatest amount of honest self-sacrifice.

The general conclusion to which we are brought by such reflections is this, that, if Party Spirit were overcome, there is no reason why bodies of men which are now discordant might not act together, forming in fact One Great Loyal Party of the Church of England, and including within itself such varieties as would help to give animation to the whole body. How easy it would be to arrange sets of well-known names, belonging to men who are presumed to belong to different Schools, but who could co-operate very well, if only they were to meet with a desire of co-operation! A demand for mutual forbearance is good for all of us; and some giving up of partizan peculiarities is no great sacrifice to make for the sake of the general benefit.

An appeal might surely be made to High Churchmen to withdraw from too close an association with an extreme party which is not really faithful to the Church of England as it is. The best friends of Anglican High Churchmen will not be found on the confines of the Church of Rome: and there is much danger, as we have seen, lest they should be drawn by assimilation into modes of thought from which at present they recoil. It is worth while, too, for them to consider that, if they themselves retain their independence, those over whom they have influence, their families, their younger friends, are not unlikely to recede further and further from the Church of their Fathers. Thus a want of decisive action now may result in serious defections hereafter. The loyal High Churchmen have really more in common with the Evangelicals than with those whom, for want of a better name, we must call Ritualists. Is it not worth while, in such a case, to consider how much substantial unity there is in the midst of divergences of mere phraseology? Let the High Churchmen, too, remember how much of what they justly value has been already won. Our ecclesiastical edifices, for instance, are by no means what they used to be: a broader and juster view has been obtained over the past history of Christendom; and on all questions connected with public worship a healthy tone has been diffused, which is not likely again to degenerate.

And surely to the Evangelicals themselves an appeal might be made in like manner, that they should not keep aloof from the general body by limiting themselves to their own confined circles, that they should cherish wider sympathies, that they should have so much confidence in the truth which they hold, as to believe that it will combine with all other truths. Much, in fact, for which these excellent men and their predecessors have contended, has been attained. Some views of religion, which were once unpopular, have now been widely diffused and accepted; and it is not wise to draw off now from contact with the general interests of the time, and from conflict, if need be, with opponents. For devotional purposes there are indeed special advantages in small Clerical Meetings, the members of which are all of one mind; but there are also great advantages to the Church in well-conducted Ruri-Decanal Chapters. At the present crisis too it seems hardly prudent for the Evangelical Body to leave the discussion and organization of Diocesan Synods almost entirely in other hands: nor is it quite consistent in them to find fault with Convocation, because it is only an opportunity for oral discussion.* Their influence moreover is far too important and valuable to be dispensed with at these various meetings. No doubt such meetings involve collisions of opinion and feeling; but no men ought to conclude that nothing can be learnt from opponents: and it may confidently be said that if the Evangelicals will come out a little more boldly into the general arena, they will be heartily welcomed by many on the High Church side, who fully appreciate their high character and abundant service.

Finally, it must be urged upon all, that our allegiance is due, in every case, not to the party with which we are accidentally connected, but to the Church of our Baptism. It must be acknowledged with thankfulness that there is, in many parts of the country, much combination for the general good, with large exercise of brotherly love among those who considerably differ, and will perhaps considerably differ to the end. Still this combination on the part of some has alarmed others, and

* A recent paper (August) in the 'Christian Advocate and Review,' by the Rev. E. Garbett, on "Convocation, Church Congresses, and Diocesan Synods," is well worthy of careful attention, both for the hope it gives in regard to the two former, and the salutary cautions it suggests in regard to the latter.

so caused renewed alienation. Hence among those who are really religious, and really faithful to the Church of England, duty requires assiduous efforts for mutual understanding, quite as much as firmness in the maintenance of distinctive principles.

A common ground for such mutual understanding and friendly co-operation may easily be found in the Book of Common Prayer: and it is a happy circumstance that all parties in the Church agree in love of this our ancient inheritance, except, indeed, a few extreme men, who seek to destroy our English characteristics by merging them in the modern Latin uniformity of the Continent. With them it is natural to treat our services with ridicule and sarcasm, to parade their weak points, and to procure acceptance for an exotic system by making us discontented with our own.

It is, however, hardly enough in this argument to put allegiance to the Prayer-Book forward in this merely general and abstract way. It is almost essential to note some smaller particulars, in which there is at present disunion, and in which there might easily be union, if the sensitiveness of partizanship could be cured. There are times when little things are of great moment. Such is the case now in all matters relating to Public Worship. Some of the worst irritation is caused by matters which in themselves are trivial, and indeed, admitted to be trivial, even by those who insist upon them. Hence carelessness or obstinacy in regard to such things is a breach of charity; so that a patient attention may be fairly asked, and no offence ought to be taken, while a few remarks are made on some minor points of rubrical phraseology and ritual observance.

A few axioms may be laid down at the outset in regard to such matters. It is assumed, in the first place, that in themselves they are unimportant. Hence to magnify them either way into importance, whether by foolishly insisting or by foolishly protesting, must be wrong. "Circumcision is nothing," says St. Paul twice.* It is sometimes forgotten that he adds, with precisely the same emphasis in both cases, that "Uncircumcision is nothing." Now when there is a rule in the Prayer-Book, it is

* 1 Cor. vii. 19; Gal. vi. 15.

under ordinary circumstances desirable that the rule should be kept,—not under the influence of that mere rubrical pedantry, which is one of the worst enemies of spiritual worship,—but because very serious questions have arisen, and because it is a duty to strengthen the hands of the Bishops and not to place ourselves at a disadvantage in an argument. Next, when no rule exists, it is desirable to follow custom. Now customs vary. There are differences, and recognised differences, between the Parish Church and the Cathedral. There are differences, too, on a broad view, to a very considerable extent, between the North and the South of England. There is a touch of the Puritan spirit in the former, with a good deal of rough independence. In the latter, if there is a greater disposition to reverence, we need not call it by a bad name. And finally, the highest of all moral rubrics is to be most religiously observed by all of us. We must be considerate of one another. We must aim at doing mutual good. Each must "look" not only on "his own things," or the things of his party, but also on the "things of others."* No doubt, as has been said above, when the great doctrinal question of the day is really at stake, we are bound to be firm in resistance; and of course there will be differences of opinion as to the degree in which this or that usage is likely to promote what we think positively wrong; but, on the whole there will not be much difficulty in distinguishing, if we can lay aside our Party Spirit.

We may take, as an illustration, in the first place, the currency which the term "Altar" has obtained amongst us, as synonymous with "Communion Table." There is, of course, a mere popular and conversational use of the former word, or a poetical use of it, as in Hymns, to which it might be fanciful to object; and no doubt it was employed in this way by some of the Early Fathers. But still a question arises now, whether it may not be wise to avoid the practice; and there are arguments in favour of this view which may be expected to weigh with High Churchmen. The term "Altar" is most studiously avoided in the Prayer-Book. It does not occur in any one of the rubrics connected with the celebration of the Communion. The term "Holy Table," a most reverent and

* Phil. ii. 4. See Rom. xv. 2.

suitable phrase, is given to us by authority.* All this, too, is in harmony with what we read on the subject in the New Testament. All the circumstances of the institution of this Sacrament, and all the phraseology of St. Paul in referring to it, point to the idea of a Table, and away from the idea of an Altar. The negative argument arising from the mode in which certain things are mentioned in Scripture is often the strongest of all. The force of such a passage as this is extreme: "Do ye not know that they which wait at the Altar are partakers with the Altar? *Even so* hath the Lord ordained that *they which preach the Gospel* should live of the Gospel!"† It is almost impossible that the Apostle's sentence could have taken such a form, if he had recognised the use of an altar as a part of the Christian system.

To turn now from a matter of phraseology to a matter of usage, no little discomfort has been caused lately in connection with the attitude in which the hands are placed for the reception of the bread in the Holy Communion. Under most circumstances any one writing seriously would be ashamed to refer to so trivial a subject. But now trivialities have become the disturbers of our peace and of our devotions. What is the right course for the Clergy to follow in regard to this particular point? Surely it is best to treat it as indifferent, and to reserve any advice upon it for private opportunities. It is said that communicants have been passed by, or forced to alter the attitude of their hands, because the open palm was not presented. What can justify, at so solemn a time, such a forbidding of an usage

* Consistency with the Prayer-Book in little things supplies a very useful rule, the observance of which might save us from a good many silly shibboleths. A Low Churchman will find fault with such phrases as "*Holy* Communion" and "*Holy* Baptism," whereas they are conspicuous and customary in our authorised book. The High Churchman, in place of the usual phraseology, feels a delight in speaking of "Matins," and "Evensong," though he finds the terms only in the list of Lessons and Psalms. Sometimes the insertion or omission of a letter in the abbreviated designation of the Saints, is supposed to indicate different schools of Theology. Even on so weighty a point as this the Book of Common Prayer might reasonably be allowed to be the umpire.

† 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14. See x. 18 *on* "*Israel after the flesh.*" This is not written in forgetfulness of the employment of the word "Altar" in Heb. xiii. 10. But to give this phrase a literal and local reference suddenly brings down the whole strain of the argument to a low level. Surely any one reading the Epistle fairly and simply, must agree with Waterland in giving the substance of the passage thus:—"Christians have an *altar*, whereof they partake: and that altar is Christ our Lord, who is *altar, priest*, and *sacrifice*, all in one."—'Works' (1823), vii. 330. See also viii. 107, 108.

which has prevailed immemorially? There is nothing decisive in the rubric which directs that the Communion is to be "delivered" to the people in their hands; and it is impossible not to suspect that the sectarian 'Little Prayer-Book,' and not our English 'Book of Common Prayer,' really expresses the spirit of the procedure. But is the conduct of those Clergy more reasonable and charitable, who, under precisely contrary circumstances, follow a similar course? It is said that communicants have been passed by, or forced to alter the attitude of their hands, because the open palm *was* presented. Can it possibly be wise or right thus to disturb the devotional feeling of a fellow-worshipper, and to cause irritation at a moment when comfort is sought? Who can wonder if the High Church party is strengthened by such proceedings on the part of Evangelical Clergymen?

As regards the usage of particular congregations, in all matters of indifference, it is surely best to acquiesce in it, whatever it may be. Let us take, as an illustration, the practice of turning to the East at the Creeds.* This is one of those very cases where a traditional contrast has grown up between the College Chapel and Cathedral on the one hand, and the Parish Church on the other, and to a certain degree also between the North and the South of England. There is no rubric whatever to guide us. And this may be said confidently, that this ancient practice has no reference to the "Altar" or to any special "Presence" localised there. Let any one consult our old-fashioned authority, Bingham, on this point.† The fact, too, that our churches are built towards the East is decisive; for a church cannot be said to be turned towards the "Altar" which it contains within itself. As to looking Eastwards at a solemn moment of worship, we may say, with Clement of Alexandria, that we do this "because the East is the image of our spiritual nativity, and represents the heavenly light which has arisen on our dark minds;" or with St. Basil, that "Paradise was there, and that we seek our ancient habitation and country;" or with Athanasius, that our Saviour "was born

* Other obvious instances are the use of the gown or surplice in preaching, and the form of prayer (for which the rubric gives no directions) before the sermon.

† 'Antiq. of the Chr. Church,' Book xiii. Ch. viii. Sec. 15.

and lived there, was crucified there, and there rose again and ascended into heaven." Whatever the thought in our minds may be, it may be confidently added that we gain nothing by taking the poetry out of our religion, and that by mere isolated protests in this matter we suggest the very associations which we justly condemn.*

The absolute rejection of all symbolism in worship is an impossibility to English Churchmen, who use the "sign of the cross" in Baptism.† The act of Kneeling, too, is itself symbolical. The mention of this subject takes our thoughts to a practical question which is really serious. Our rubrics direct that we should kneel during our public prayers; and the natural instinct of a reverent mind is in harmony with the rubrics. But how indecorous and irreligious is the self-satisfied and indolent attitude assumed by the majority of all ranks in our congregations, both in town and country! And does not considerable blame in this matter rest upon the Clergy for having taken so little notice of it, upon Heads of Families for not having trained the young to a habit of outward respect for religion,‡ and upon Church-builders, for having constructed sacred edifices as if they were intended only for listening? But, to return to the subject of Party Spirit as shown in lesser observances, and to conclude what is to be said on this topic, it is most important, surely, not to disturb or annoy our fellow-worshippers by peculiarities of our own. To bow at the mention of the Sacred Name, in the more solemn parts of the Public Service, is enjoined by the Canons;§ and it is most inconsistent for those to object to this, who are ready to quote the Canons as of authority in other matters: but if it is a point of conscience to bow at certain other parts of the service, at least this might

* In congregations where it is the custom to turn to the East at the Creeds, the officiating Clergyman may silently refute the notion of any reference to the "Altar," by turning to the East at the Nicene as well as the Apostles' Creed.

† The Canon, however, referred to in the note at the end of the Baptismal Service shows that the use of this sign on other occasions is not according to the mind of the Church of England: and both in that note and in the note on kneeling at the end of the Communion Service, we are admonished that symbolism is always liable to run into excess.

‡ The distinct understanding as to gestures which evidently exists among the extreme Ritualists indicates the presence of a kind of "disciplina arcani." Might it not be well, however, that those who justly set a value on simplicity should inculcate definite habits of reverence in worship, both at home and in church?

§ Can. xviii. (1603).

be done unobtrusively. Or again, if we find ourselves in a congregation, during the Communion, where it is the custom to be seated during the Exhortation, and not even to stand during the "Gloria in Excelsis," we may regret the irregularity, but it is best to acquiesce in the practice. Above all, we ought to be very careful not to show our principles in such a way as to make them ludicrous. No great victory will be obtained simply by standing when others are seated, or by being seated when others are standing. M. Rouher said very sagaciously, not long ago, on an occasion when the peace of Europe was in danger, and when the attitude to be assumed by France was in question, "*Les protestations ne persuadent jamais.*"

But now, while the Prayer-Book has been put forward as a common ground for agreement, nothing has been said in this to hinder our entertaining the idea of a revision of the Prayer-Book. There is often heard amongst us a parrot cry, "The Prayer-Book as it is; the Prayer-Book as it is:" which is likely to do serious harm. Perhaps the Ritualists have done some useful service to us, in teaching us to contemplate the possibility that our existing Religious Offices may not be infallibly perfect.* As to the difficulties attending an effort at reconstruction, no doubt there are risks, but risks must be boldly faced in critical times: and the facility with which Lord Stanhope succeeded in obliterating the State Services, and the general contentment which has followed the New Subscription Act, may show us that preliminary panic is not always the true measure of ultimate danger. Some further relaxations may perhaps be found possible, when the Ritual Commission has concluded its labours. This is not the place for details. But is it not a very serious evil that a Parish Clergyman cannot preach to a rough congregation of uneducated men without first having decorously gone through a long stereotyped service, which is pitched in a very high devotional key, and the mere understanding of which is an absolute impossibility to them? And are there not many

* It is a significant fact that in Mr. Thorold's Essay (p. 593), the *Articles* are ranked among the formularies which it may be desirable to revise. Hitherto on the Evangelical side the Articles have been viewed as a fixed doctrinal standing-ground, from which some revision of the Services may be safely contemplated: just as on the other side the Services have been regarded as placing us on the general ground of the Church at large, the Articles being viewed from thence as adapted merely for a temporary emergency.

occasions when abbreviated or modified services would be a boon? What harm, again, would follow, if a certain latitude in such points were conceded to the Clergy, the limits of that latitude being defined, and an appeal to the Bishop being always open? And may it not be possible that if we could once admit the possibility of improving our liturgical arrangements, we could learn something from the experience of America and the Colonies? Our Sister Church in the United States, for instance, directs, in a rubric of the Communion Service, that, immediately before the act of communicating, a hymn is to be sung from the Appointed Selection.* If some authorised innovations were made so as to give a more Eucharistic character to that Service, we might possibly be less in danger from some modern unauthorised innovations.

This allusion to the other side of the Atlantic suggests something further. The Lambeth Conference witnessed so warm a recognition of the "Protestant Episcopal" Communion of America as a true and orthodox branch of the Catholic Church, that there would surely be nothing very terrible in our adopting such modifications in regard to the Public Service, as that Communion has found desirable and possible. The giving up of the public recital of the Athanasian Creed at times of worship, and the modifying of some phrases in the Burial Service,† would be a great satisfaction to many devout Lay-people, and would relieve the Clergy from those elaborate explanations which, however satisfactory, are still necessary. The Preface to the Prayer-Book most distinctly admits the lawfulness, and contemplates the possibility, of changes according to circumstances from time to time; and there are circumstances among ourselves at this time in England which, connected with

* "*Here shall be sung a Hymn, or part of a Hymn, from the Selection for the Feasts and Fasts.*"—'The Book of Common Prayer, &c., according to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America' (New York, 1859). A later rubric runs thus:—"*Then shall be said or sung, all standing,* Gloria in Excelsis, or some proper Hymn from the Selection." It ought to be added that one authorised collection of Hymns is used throughout the Union.

† It may be noted, as a minor point, that our Burial Service is not in all respects very suitable for Infants. The Roman Catholic Church has a special service for the case of Baptised Children. In such case the bell is not to be used, or at any rate "non sono lugubri sed potius festivo pulsari debet;" and among the words used are the following:—"Sinite parvulos venire ad Me. *Talium est regnum cœlorum.*"—'Rituale Rom.' Antw. 1625, p. 209.

the attitudes of the various Non-conforming communities, make the consideration of such a subject very opportune.

Before the apparition of those extremes in the direction of the Church of Rome, which have been conscientiously, though, it is hoped, not unjustly censured in this paper, there was a manifest drawing of the mind and affection of many Nonconformists towards the Church of England. Ritualism has naturally produced a recoil.* But now this very Ritualism is beginning to create, within the Church of England itself, through the operation of a wholesome fear, a more considerate disposition towards the Dissenters than used formerly to prevail. This may then, perhaps, be a golden opportunity. The same kindly feeling towards the Church which existed before this disloyal movement became so prominent, may possibly return, if it is seen that the great body of the Clergy pronounce clearly against the Ritualists. Changes of sentiment in regard to worship are developing themselves largely among Dissenters.† Some of their Ministers are feeling deeply the heavy burden of having to produce every Sunday, in addition to sermons, suitable prayers, presumed to be extemporaneous. We hear too of liturgical tendencies spreading among the Presbyterians of New York. In Scotland we know

---

* That letter of the venerable ex-President of the Wesleyan Body, which has been read lately in the newspapers, is certainly an important document. The word "Episcopalians," too, as applied to the Church of England in that quarter, has a new sound. The change may have partly been provoked by some words which were used in the last meeting of the Northern Convocation at York: and it is not certain that the "Conference," which consists entirely of Ministers, represents the feeling of the more influential Wesleyan Laymen.

† While the Church Congress was being held in York, another Conference of some interest and importance was going on at Sheffield. In the speeches at the *Congregational Union*, it was suggested that some kind of liturgy might be desirable "both for the help of the people and the relief of the Minister; that stated services for worship, without sermons, might be useful; and that the people should be encouraged to respond." One speaker said that there was too much of the "one man" system in the existing services; another said that he twice made the attempt to "realise his idea of helping the people a little more in public worship, but altogether avoiding the Prayer-Book, on account of the prejudice against it;" that each time he had consigned the result to the flames, and, "at last, after going to every other available source, he found that he could find no language so fitted to carry out his idea as that of the Book of Common Prayer." At the same time similar discussions on the same subject were going on in the *Baptist Union* at Liverpool. There it was urged that the Lord's Supper should be celebrated every Sunday: reasons were given in favour of a modified liturgy: prayer, it was remarked, should not always be dependent on the mood of the Minister: undue prominence was now given to the Sermon. Another indication of the same tendencies is to be found in a volume of 'Common Prayer for Evangelical Churches' (1867), with an explanatory "Introduction" printed separately.

that extemporaneous prayer is a point of honour. To meddle with Scotland on a point of honour is dangerous. Yet even there considerable changes of opinion are taking place in regard to this matter;* and if irritating circumstances were avoided, and time were given for those who cannot easily be convinced to come gradually round, an assimilation of views, not without very happy consequences, might by degrees take place among those who have hitherto widely differed. On our part the obvious duties are to avoid approximations to distinctively Roman usages, and to be willing to make adaptations according to the exigencies of the times, "keeping," in the words of Bishop Sanderson's Preface, "the mean between too much stiffness in refusing, and too much easiness in admitting variations in things once advisedly established."

This leads to another concluding remark of a general kind. Nothing has been said in these pages which is hostile to that great idea of the Reunion of Christendom, which, in various directions and under various forms, has recently laid hold of many minds. Weariness of controversy—a sense of the weakness caused by division—with the spread of cosmopolitan feelings, a consciousness that all nations have a common interest, and a more familiar acquaintance with other countries acquired through travel—all these things have conspired to help the more purely religious desires for union. Sometimes this whole idea is derided as fanciful and absurd. Yet, when we think of our Saviour's words concerning the evidence to be supplied by a United Church,† when we see how divisions once established have a tendency to stereotype themselves, we must come to the conclusion that the cause of Reunion is worthy of some effort and some sacrifice. But here Religious Party Spirit comes in once more, even among those who have such feelings, and complicates the problem. The wish for union with the Church of Rome has surely its good side as well as its bad side; but some are made so angry by the very mention of that Church,—

* The late Dr. Lee's influence may not have been extensive; and his book on 'The Reform of the Church of Scotland in Worship' (1864) is not altogether written in a kindly spirit; but it is an indication of a new and growing school of thought. A reference may be made also to a book published in 1867 at Edinburgh, entitled 'Euchologium, or Book of Prayers: being Forms of Worship issued by the Church Service Society.'

† John xvii. 21.

they are so thoroughly convinced that Christianity ran underground from Augustine to Luther,—that they cannot look over the barrier which their passion has raised, to see if there is anything good on the other side. Another form of party prejudice is to group together the Greek Church and the Roman Church, as though they were equally and in the same sense corrupt, and in controversy to be treated in the same way. Now certainly no one can have travelled among the Churches of the East without becoming aware that they are sunk in much superstition. Moreover it is obvious to find the same fault with their Service Books which we find with those of the Roman Church. But when we turn to dogmatic standards of Doctrine, the two Communions very sensibly diverge. The Catechisms of the Greek Church might be used, with very few alterations, among ourselves. Throughout the Papal part of Western Europe there is, on the other hand, the one great hindrance presented by the decrees of the Council of Trent. No such imperative statement of wrong doctrine exists in the Greek Church; and with the possibility of Reformation are obviously bound up some possibilities of Reunion. We must add, too, that the Greeks share all our English repugnance to the Papacy, and that their feeling towards ourselves is very different from the feeling of the Latins.

But turning towards this question from a different starting-point, we see the exclusive spirit at work in another way. In some quarters Reunion is most warmly advocated, but in such a manner as absolutely to exclude all Dissenters at home and all Foreign Protestants from any consideration. They are simply treated as if they did not exist. Now this view is utterly unreal and quite inconsistent with the facts of the case. The question indeed of an authorised and continuous Ministry is of essential importance. But this is not the only question in a matter of this kind. The large amount of true religious life among Dissenters should make some Controversialists and Reunionists pause, and consider whether they be not really postponing the greater to the less. Can any reasonable man say that there is more spiritual religion in an average Greek or Spaniard than in an average Baptist or Methodist in England? We seem happily now to be at a turn of the tide in regard to consideration of our Nonconforming countrymen. But the great impediment to

reunion with them is our own disunion through Party Spirit. In the most religious minds among them there may be many desires for the healing of old wounds; but what have we to offer, if we are so divided into parties ourselves?

The close consideration of this subject is strongly urged upon us by the circumstances of the whole of Christendom. The Church of England is in a most remarkable position in the midst of the Churches of the world. Among the various feelings which are found within its enclosure, and which might be amicably and harmoniously combined, if Party Spirit were absent, are affinities with Ancient Hierarchies, with German thought, and with Protestant independence. Meantime great religious changes are probably impending elsewhere. Theology will not stand still on the Continent. Such men as Döllinger and Passaglia represent very serious movements. Who knows what results may follow from the extreme tension under which the whole Papal Church is placed by the preparations for a so-called Œcumenical Council? What is the best course for us to follow now, in the hope of being made useful to other communities hereafter? Surely it is to hold our own ground firmly, to be true to our own principles, while still cherishing wide sympathies in our hearts. The Church of England seems providentially furnished with singular facilities for promoting Reunion, when God's time shall have come. Great opportunities may present themselves sooner than we expect. In order to use them aright we must be true to our own history, and we must foster mutual love among ourselves.

Some severe things have been said in this Essay, and there is no doubt that the religious crisis through which we are beginning to pass is very serious. But still the subject has a bright side. There are many hopeful circumstances among us that may well inspire the trust that the Divine blessing is with us, and that better times will come.

> "Ponamus nimios gemitus: flagrantior æquo
> Non debet dolor esse viri, nec vulnere major."

The standard of work among the Clergy is higher than at any former period. The Lay-people, both men and women, are displaying an increased willingness to give of their service and their time, as well as of their money, in furtherance of Christian ends.

There is indeed an abundance of reckless and lawless thought in matters of Religion; but anything is better than indifference and stagnation. And perhaps the most hopeful symptoms of all are those which indicate the presence of a devotional spirit in conjunction with activity. Hence it is a great satisfaction to note the remarkable growth of a love for Hymns which has characterised the last few years, and this in all sections of the Church.

Sacred Poetry and Sacred Music may truly be viewed both as manifestations of unity of feeling and as means for promoting it. The expressions of Prayer and Praise in a rhythmical form, which began to come into existence during the earliest days of the Church, and which have been accumulating through the ages ever since, are treasures of inestimable value, if considered only as bonds of union between one community and another. Sacred Hymns have this characteristic, that they present to us Christian life on that side where there is the greatest unanimity. In going over the course of Church History from century to century we encounter sad scenes of angry controversy. It is not meant that this controversy has been unnecessary. But in such scenes it is at least true that we do not see Christian life in its most attractive and winning aspect. And we gladly turn from them to that undercurrent of devotional thought which has often been a real bond of union among those who have appeared the most sharply divided. True Christian experience is everywhere the same. Hence the utterance of it in words—especially when they take a form which satisfies the taste and excites the imagination—can easily be transferred and adapted from one age to another, from one nation to another, from language to language, from Church to Church. Large streams of holy poetry have diffused themselves from Hebrew sources into all parts of modern Christendom. The two classical languages, themselves Christianised, have made their contributions to this treasure. Every modern language too has its own hymns; and every age is making its contributions, as well as every tongue. And the point on which stress is here laid is this, that whenever and wherever a really good hymn has been composed and published, it becomes thenceforward the rightful property of the Universal Church. The Christian mind never hesitates to adopt it, from whatever source it comes. The controversial barriers fade away

for the moment before this unanimity of religious feeling. Our Church Collections contain, almost side by side, hymns of the Puritan Baxter, and of Ken, the Nonjuring Bishop; but no want of harmony between these sacred poems is perceptible. We love them both, and thankfully use them both. Wesley and Toplady, at a later period, were hotly engaged on different sides of a vehement debate; but who thinks of this now, when their hymns are read in private or sung in public? And what Churchman is so stiff as to repel any really good Nonconformist Hymn? He would certainly not be in harmony with the ordinary editions of our Book of Common Prayer, though it may not be universally known that the lines which are printed at the end of the Metrical Psalms, and which we constantly use on Communion Sundays, were composed by Philip Doddridge.

It may truly be said that the divided Church, in this gradual accumulation of Hymns, has been storing up medicine for its own wounds. Nor is this medicine a mere anodyne. When it was remarked above that Sacred Poetry and Sacred Song are delightfully contrasted with the passions of angry debate, it was not meant that Doctrine was a matter of indifference: not so—but that in this devotional language and harmony we have the most soothing, most elevating, exponents of "sound Doctrine."* Such a train of thought as this, at the close of our own reflections on Parties and Party Spirit, ought to make us feel that, if we were living more truly according to the mind of Christ, we might have the benefits of the former without the harm of the latter—that we might have combination without contention, and animated discussion without malice—and that our divergences might rather stimulate than mar the spirit of general charity. Is it not strange that any Christians should prefer the acrid taste of partizan controversy, when they might have, in all their sweetness, the milk and the honey of mutual trust and generous love?

John S. Howson.

---

* Wherever there seems to be a disposition to obscure our Lord's Divinity in Hymns, this tendency ought to be most carefully watched. Such deterioration in public expressions of Prayer and Praise was closely connected with other marks of religious decay in German Protestantism during the last century.

00110879

LONDON:

PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, DUKE STREET, STAMFORD STREET,
AND CHARING CROSS.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 19 September, 2016